CAUTION: ZIONISM!

YURI IVANOV

YURI IVANOV

CAUTION: ZIONISM!

Essays on the Ideology, Organisation and Practice of Zionism

Progress Publishers · Moscow

Translated from the Russian
Designed by Vadim Kuleshov

ЮРИЙ ИВАНОВ
ОСТОРОЖНО: СИОНИЗМ!

Очерки по идеологии,
организации и практике сионизма

На английском языке

First printing 1970

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	5
Chapter I. MYTH AND REALITY	11
Chapter II. "A TIME TO CAST AWAY STONES, AND A TIME TO GATHER STONES TOGETHER"	37
Chapter III. ROOFLESS LABYRINTH	65
Chapter IV. CROSSROADS	97
Chapter V. CAUTION: ZIONISM!	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY	167

To fellow countrymen and foreign comrades whose kind advice has been of such help.

Yuri Ivanov

PREFACE

Gone are the days when the enemies of the young Soviet republic fervently awaited the collapse of the world's first workers' and peasants' state. The Land of Soviets proved its viability in the face of armed intervention and its magnificent performance in the life-and-death struggle against the nazi hordes already belongs to history. Gone, indeed, are many of the illusions harboured by the enemies of communism, but not their hatred and their intention to continue the struggle with all the means that remain at their disposal.

Lenin held that it was the fundamental duty of the Soviet press to make a concrete analysis of the forces acting against communism, however secondary they might appear at first glance. This book makes a study of modern Zionism, one of the most tenacious, though veiled varieties of anti-communism.

Meir Vilner, Secretary of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel, wrote in a letter to Soviet journalists in January 1968: "Zionism is, alas, a 'forgotten' question but nonetheless a most actual one. . . ." How right he is! For a long time many champions of Zionism were sparing no efforts to make Zionism appear nothing more than an obsolete term. It would be rash to think of it as being purely by chance that what is in effect a bellicose reactionary force should have managed until recently to avoid world public attention. This was without doubt one of the main factors on which the existence of an international corporation of Zionists operating in the interests of imperialist reaction depended.

At the time when the World Zionist Organisation (WZO) was being formed, Lenin with his habitual foresight noted

on more than one occasion that Zionism was a reactionary trend of the Jewish bourgeoisie.

Are there any historical facts or fresh data requiring that this appraisal be revised (something on which Zionists and their supporters have been focussing their efforts for many years)? There are no such facts. Indeed, there are hundreds of facts pointing to the contrary; they are to be found first and foremost in Zionist documents and Zionist political literature, which are eloquent proof that Lenin's definition of Zionism holds good to this day. Moreover, unanimously supported by the imperialist forces and having assimilated most trends of Jewish bourgeois nationalism, Zionism has become the major trend of the latter and acquired new reactionary features.

Modern Zionism is the ideology, a ramified system of organisations and the practical politics of the wealthy Jewish bourgeoisie which has closely allied itself with monopoly circles in the USA and other imperialist countries. The main content of Zionism is bellicose chauvinism and anti-communism.

Attacking the socialist community, the international communist and working-class movement, Zionism is also opposing the national liberation movement. Practical proof of this is the aggression of the Israeli militarists against the Arab states which began in June 1967.

Two basic categories of people were impressed by the military results of this aggression: the traditionally narrow-minded and short-sighted Philistines in a number of countries, and the revanchists in Bonn who still take delight in the idea of a blitzkrieg.

But the tragedy in the Middle East compelled the vast majority of people, who have no use for superficial appraisals of developments, to search for answers to a whole range of fundamental questions: what forces created the *initial impression* that here was Israel taking on a whole group of Arab states "single-handed"? Who managed to preparatorily brainwash a section of the public in West European countries and the USA in favour of the Israeli militarists? Who gathered intelligence and uncovered some of the military and state secrets of the Arab countries? Who helped Israel arrange financial and military deals in absolute secrecy?

Since all this could not possibly have been accomplished solely by Israel's secret service and her propaganda

machinery, there is a clear inference of co-operation between the Israeli militarists and the ruling circles of the imperialist powers. Correct as this assumption may be, it is not a sufficient explanation* and suggests the existence of an intermediate link which helped Israel to make secret preparations for her latest expansionist move and attempt to overthrow the progressive regimes in the United Arab Republic and Syria by force. The international Zionist association played this role, acting as a secret channel between the most reactionary forces of the imperialist states, especially the USA, the FRG and Britain, on the one hand, and the Israeli militarists, on the other.

It would be wrong, however, to think of international Zionism's role in the Middle East conflict as being solely that of a connecting link. In very general terms the pattern of dependence of the main participants in the aggression is as follows: the Israeli militarists—international Zionism —Western imperialist circles headed by the USA.

The Israeli ruling circles are junior partners in the international Zionist concern: this is indeed one of the most important conditions of their existence as ruling circles. The "Zionist Concern", represented by the World Zionist Organisation, the World Jewish Congress, which is really a branch of the former, and numerous other offshoots, whose role is sometimes more important than that played by organisations with a signboard at their entrance, is at the same time one of the world's largest associations of finance capital, a self-styled global "ministry" for the affairs of "world Jewry", an international intelligence centre, and a well-run misinformation and propaganda service. The cardinal aim of the concern's "departments" whose operations are guided from a single centre, is amassment of profits and wealth ensuring them power and a parasitical well-being within the imperialist system. Needless to say, defence and consolidation of imperialism's positions is part and parcel of this main objective of international Zionism.

Economically, the World Zionist Organisation has very close ties with the monopolies of the major imperialist

---

* During the aggression official propaganda in France, for example, was not pro-Israeli because of the de Gaulle Government's foreign policy, and pro-Israeli propaganda was conducted by French WZO branches.

powers, and especially the United States. Like the US monopolies, the Zionist concern has an extensive and long-standing range of "business interests" in the Middle East. This being the case, its role in that part of the world has been far more than that of "messenger boy". The Zionist concern acted as an "employer" with regard to Israeli ruling circles, while in its dealings with the US monopolies it was by no means a minor participant in the criminal scramble for spoils in the finance jungle.

The "Six Day War" was not the first and probably not the last venture of international Zionism, whose range of interests and plans is not limited to the area of the Suez Canal. But the aggression of June 1967 was one of the rare occasions on which international Zionism, breaking the old and firmly established rules of its game, slightly lifted the veil shrouding its activity. Israel's Prime Minister Levi Eshkol let the cat out of the bag when he mentioned the sum which Zionist organisations freely granted Israeli ruling circles shortly after the outbreak of the war; an international conference of Jewish millionaires was held in Israel; and to the amazement of millions of their fellow countrymen, Zionists in a number of countries widely celebrated the successes of the Israeli armed forces. However, it must be stressed that this was a rare episode in the history of the international Zionist association, which prefers more covert forms of activity.

Over the last decade Zionist specialists in camouflage have developed a tendency to talk about a "complete collapse" of Zionism. Laments and mournful wails ring out from the rostrums of international Zionist get-togethers. This campaign is skilfully fanned by the Zionist press. Here, for example, is what the Israeli Zionist newspaper *Mibbifnim* wrote between the 1957 and 1967 acts of aggression in the Middle East: "Zionism is beset by a severe, unprecedented crisis.... It is a three-sided crisis—involving the ideology, movement and practice of Zionism.... Its scale and depth show that this is not a transitory phenomenon, engendered by economic or political difficulties or controversy over current issues. The crisis affects the very heart of our movement, its core, the centre of the Jewish problem.... The crisis is just so serious in that it arises from the inside, from the heart of the movement, from the heart of its political and ideological leadership."[1] But it would be a

mistake to ignore the real aims of the authors of such remarks.

Zionism is a reactionary system of views and a system of reactionary organisations serving imperialism. In other words, Zionism is a class phenomenon. *And Zionism, like the whole imperialist system, is indeed in a state of profound crisis.* Nevertheless, on the basis of facts that shed light on the ruses of Zionist propaganda-makers, the only conclusion to be drawn is that the *potentialities, freedom of manoeuvre, the destiny and ultimate doom of Zionism are directly contingent to the possibilities, destiny and ultimate doom of the exploiter class, on the destiny and doom of imperialism.*

Zionism naturally finds it more and more difficult to operate in our day and age. But it is still a highly experienced, cunning enemy of internationalism, the friendship and fraternity of all nations, a dangerous instrument in the hands of imperialist reaction.

People who know little or nothing about Zionism tend to associate it either with the State of Israel as a whole, or with the Jews in general. It is these erroneous notions that best of all suit the leaders of international Zionism and are cultivated by Zionist propaganda.

Since a considerable number of Jewish working people in different countries, including Israel, forthrightly reject Zionist views, the leaders of Zionism are vitally concerned that all Jews, wherever they are and whatever their views, should be classed as Zionists, so that the "waverers" are pushed into serving Zionism's criminal aims.

Chapter I

MYTH AND REALITY

As an ideology and organisation Zionism made its appearance at the close of the 19th century, a period of fierce class battles of the international proletariat as the transformation of capitalism into imperialism entered its final stage.

Ostensibly Zionist ideology was concerned with the setting up of a "Jewish state", and thus could well have appeared at first sight to be at once pathetically impotent, clerically naive and rather touching even, with its high-flown phrases of the type: "If there is a book of books—the Bible, if there is a Biblical people, then there must be a biblical land...."

It should be pointed out that these words, shedding light on one aspect of the Zionist programme, were not uttered by one of the founders of Zionism long since deceased. They come from a speech by General Moshe Dayan in which he demanded unconditional annexation of the captured Arab territories.[2]

In the works of the classics of Zionism the following themes recur frequently: colonial-territorial claims; propaganda of class peace among the Jews and their unification on racial principles in individual countries and on an international scale; contraposition of the peoples of the world to the Jews as anti-Semites; moralising about the racial purity and exclusiveness of the "chosen people"; rejection of internationalism and "theoretical" substantiation of the need to split the working-class movement; and undisguised anti-communism.* Zionism emerged as an appendage of imperial-

* It should be noted that one of the demagogic methods of defending Zionism against all attacks on *Zionism as a whole* is to qualify them as "anti-Semitic acts"; as for attacks on *Zionist ideology in particular* (since formally it purports to be concerned with the setting up of a "Jewish state"), the Zionists declare them to be "encroachments" on

ist ideology, and it should therefore not come as a surprise to anyone that the forms of this "teaching" do not correspond to its real content.

The World Zionist Organisation was founded in August 1897 in Basle at the First International Zionist Congress. Some time afterwards the World Zionist Organisation created the Jewish Colonial Trust, an international Zionist joint-stock company.

Once organised, Zionism began its activity with a fraud. Finding this "date of birth" unsatisfactory, Zionist and pro-Zionist circles energetically disseminated (for external consumption) the myth that Zionism, "seeking to set up a Jewish state", was as old as the world, since for thousands of years "the Jews had been nourishing the hope of returning to Palestine". Just as much attention, by the way, is paid to the dissemination of this myth today.

"Zionism is as old as the captivity of the Jewish people, when the Temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar,"[3] wrote Professor Norman Bentwich, a British Zionist who had written much about Palestine, but who preferred to live in Britain most of the time.

Howard Morley Sachar, a British Zionist historian, stresses that "Zion . . . was not just the chimera of the living dead. It was enshrined in the hearts of Jews in every part of the world".[4]

Nahum Sokolow, a prominent Zionist ideologue, asserts that Zionism has been an "ideal of thousands of years for which the best of our nation have laboured, struggled, suffered and died. . .".[5] He is seconded by Justice L. Brandeis, one of the oldest Zionist leaders in the USA, who writes: "Since the destruction of the Temple, nearly two thousand years ago, the longing for Palestine has been ever-present with the Jew."[6]

These quotations have been handed down from generation to generation and referred to in research papers, encyclopaedias and academic editions.

Let us for a moment forget that in the above quotations and in a vast number of other still more categorical statements, Jews are considered as existing outside time and

---

the right of the Israeli people to self-determination. We reject these base methods just as resolutely as we support the right of the Israeli state to exist, and the right of the Israeli people to rid themselves of the services of Zionist leaders who are jeopardising their future.

space, independently of the particular historical context of one or other of their communities, and that the question of classes is completely ignored. Let us return to the Zionism of 1897 and presume that it was exactly what it professed to be: a system of views, a political and financial organisation whose purpose was the establishment of a "Jewish state".

If we allow then that this was the case, the way the Zionists posed the question of the antiquity of Zionism, the thesis that Zionism "summed up and expressed" the age-old aspirations of the Jews to return to Palestine, is striking in its absurdity. For the success of the Zionist aim of setting up a "Jewish state" in Palestine at that time, once they had the necessary sums of money at their disposal (and the Rothschild bank alone had funds enough for ten Palestines), theoretically depended on two conditions—the preparedness of a considerable proportion of the Jews to move to Palestine, and the availability of support, chiefly military, from the leading imperialist powers in the matter of colonising Palestine.

But if it was true that for centuries the Jews living in different countries wanted nothing more than to move to the barren hills of Palestine, then the thesis about the antiquity of Zionism was evidently not intended for their consumption: for in that case it would have been all one to the Jews whether Zionism had appeared in the epoch of monopoly capital or whether it already existed in the 6th century B.C. We can only presume, therefore, that the myth about the antiquity of Zionism was conceived for the benefit of the rulers of the empires that existed at the turn of the century, for the purpose of enlisting their unanimous support for the projected colonisation of Palestine and the creation of a "Jewish state" there. Yet it can hardly be imagined that the Zionist leaders, skilled both in banking and politics, were ever so naive as to believe that references to genealogy or aspirations could make imperialism go half way to meet someone else's plans.

So, we return to the question: for whose benefit was this myth created, and why?

It is extremely important to find the correct answer, for the Zionists' seemingly innocent claims are but a screen concealing circumstances of an exceptionally serious nature.*

---

* Let us allow that here Zionist casuists can accuse us of "primitivising" the concept of Zionism and "vulgarising" the question

Norman Bentwich and many of his associates set a fairly exact date for the "appearance" of Zionism—the period of the "captivity of the Jewish people, when the Temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar", i.e., the sixth century B.C.

But if we were to follow the logic of the Zionist authors, the date of the appearance of Zionism should be moved back another two centuries to the time when Israel, part of King Solomon's realm (the other being Judah), fell under the onslaught of King Sargon II of Assyria (8th century B.C.) and thousands of Israelites were driven off to be resettled in Assyria, a usual measure resorted to by conquerors in those times. It should be borne in mind that the Israelites were engaged mainly in agriculture or trade. Israel traded extensively with Phoenicia and Syria, and lying "on the routes to Asia, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, it had also become commercial (and urban), while Judah . . . remained a land of poor and conservative shepherds".[7]

As Nathan Ausubel asserts, Sargon II not only sold Jews as slaves in the market but also sent them "to colonise selected regions of his far-flung empire".[8] Since back in the reign of King Solomon, his subjects and also Tyrians and Phoenicians had begun to form communities throughout the vast territory of the Near and Middle East, there are no grounds for questioning the same Ausubel who believed that after Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Judah and the migration of a considerable part of the Jews to Babylonia the latter "saw in the land of their captivity large and well-rooted Jewish communities which had been established there since the eighth century. The newcomers . . . merely swelled their numbers".[9]

---

of its antiquity. "Zionism," they will assert, "is ancient not only because Jews have been nourishing the hope of returning to Palestine for thousands of years, but also because Zionism is the idea of returning to Palestine kept alive over the ages."

Zionist theoreticians shamelessly invent a "dialectical" spiral connecting the biblical Abraham with the 19th and 20th century Zionist leaders. "It is an unbroken chain stretching from the dawn of Jewish history through all generations from *Abraham* to our own times," writes Nahum Sokolow.

But this screen of words falls apart as soon as we refer to candid statements of some of the less cautious Zionist leaders of the past. "Our return to the land of our fathers as promised in the Scriptures," wrote Theodor Herzl, the founder of the World Zionist Organisation, in 1900, "...is... of the greatest contemporary political interest to those powers which are seeking something or other in Asia."

In the view of many historians the class structure in the Jewish communities in Babylonia was the same as generally obtained in the area. There were farmers, craftsmen, landowners and petty and rich traders, and slavery was practiced.

Initially community of religion, language and way of life sufficed to preserve the cohesion of a community. But these ties were bound to weaken gradually due to influence from without—under the impact of various neighbouring cultures, and as a result of frequent intermarriage and the vigorous ousting of Hebrew by Aramaic.

There is every reason to assume that traders and moneylenders made up the influential economic class in the Babylonian Jewish communities. Many historians note this circumstance. "Recently recovered cuneiform texts," writes Lujo Brentano, a German scholar, "show that the resettled Jews were active in commerce. They practiced moneylending which was widespread among the Babylonians and were also wealthy traders."[10]

The wealthy section of the Babylonian Jewish communities viewed this process of assimilation with apprehension, as a threat to their power: they could not hope to exert their control so effectively in an open, and still somewhat alien, society, as within a closed community. It is thus clear why one of the first, and according to James Parkes[11] *the* first synagogue, should have been established in Babylon, where the selfish interests of community headmen probably more than elsewhere made them aware of the need to isolate their refractory co-religionists.

The institution of the synagogue vastly enhanced the communal nature of the observance of Jewish religious rites and gripped the Jewish communities in the vice of a still more obligatory ritual. Needless to say, the entire authority of the synagogue was used exclusively to further the interests of the wealthy minority. Naturally, the transformation of the synagogues into religious, spiritual centres of the Jewish communities was a gradual process, which, moreover, did not hinder but, on the contrary, served to further the commercial and financial operations of the community hierarchy. The appearance of the synagogue, some historians contend, indirectly stimulated the transformation of the Jewish farmers in those places where they remained into urban dwellers.

It took the Jewish communities in Babylonia a relatively

short time to really put down deep roots, a fact which found its religious reflection in the summons of Jeremiah the prophet: "Build ye houses, and dwell in them; and plant gardens, and eat the fruit of them. Take ye wives, and beget sons and daughters . . . and multiply ye there, and be not diminished."[12]

In 538 B.C. Cyrus, the Persian conqueror of Babylon, in an effort to strengthen Palestine out of personal considerations, issued a proclamation permitting the Jews to return to Jerusalem. But as the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain (1917) noted, "After the proclamation issued by Cyrus, the mass of the Jewish people still remained in Babylon."[13] This view is upheld by A. T. Olmstead, a US historian, who writes: ". . .It was scarcely to be expected that the Jews already rich would abandon fertile Babylonia for the barren hills of Judah. . . ."[14]

A very significant fact illustrating the sentiments of the Babylonians is mentioned by Salo Wittmayer Baron, a US Zionist historian. Describing a somewhat later period in the life of the Babylonian Jewish community, he writes that "the Babylonian leaders insisted that in all countries prayers must be recited 'first for the scholars of Babylonia' ".[15]

Their large numbers and wealth enabled the Babylonian spiritual "fathers" of Judaism to assert, according to Baron, that "here [in Babylon—*Y.I.*] rests the chain of wisdom and prophecy, and from here [not from Jerusalem—*Y.I.*] the Torah radiates to the whole people".[16]

Thus the myth about the "ever-present longing" of the Jews to return to Palestine is exploded by facts relating to the first century A.D.

Describing the same period, *The Cambridge Ancient History* suggests that "apart from the Judaean exiles themselves [i.e., from the Babylonian community—*Y.I.*], it is not improbable that by this time Jews, whether associated with their Phoenician brethren or not, were beginning to be found scattered over the known world".[17]

The settlement of Jewish communities went on in the period of Persian domination despite the fact that the authorities were well-disposed to the resettlement of the Jews in Palestine.

Jewish traders accompanied by dependent co-religionists moved in the wake of the Persian army, settled down on captured lands and supplied the army as soldier-pedlars.[18]

The 1st century philosopher and historian Philo Judaeus wrote the following about the settlement of the Jews in the Hellenistic age: "So populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them, and, therefore, they settle in very many of the most prosperous countries in Europe and Asia, both on the islands and on the mainland."[19]

In an effort to persuade the Jews to return to Palestine (the aims pursued by the initiators of this movement will be described further on) the Zionists deliberately played up the epoch of Roman domination and particularly the uprising in Judea (A.D. 66-73) against the tyranny of the Roman Empire, and the suppression of this uprising accompanied by the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

Hoping to plant the seeds of fervid misanthropy among the Jews, the Zionists lay particular stress on the following:

1) the brutal suppression of the revolt and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, as supposingly illustrating one of the links in the chain of *singular* sufferings of the Jews, *singularly* brutal repressions against them throughout recorded history.* This Zionist thesis already holds the false element of exclusiveness which is essential in counterposing Jews to non-Jews;

2) the suppression of the uprising in Judea and the repressions which followed as being one of the most decisive facts proving the "unquestionably forcible eviction of the Jews from Palestine".

In this connection it would not be amiss to note that in the light of the destruction of Carthage, the suppression by the Romans of the revolt of the Achaean League and the disappearance of Corinth from the face of the earth, and also the stubborn, courageous struggle of the Gauls and the Britons against the Romans, the Jewish rising was no more or less heroic and its consequences no more or less sanguinary than many other episodes in the resistance to Roman rule.

As regards the forcible eviction of the Jews from Palestine, we think Leonard Stein makes an interesting point in his description of the years immediately preceding the uprising in Judea: "*Flourishing* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*] Jewish communities had long existed in Egypt and Cyrenaica, in Syria and Mesopotamia, in Italy and Greece." Stein goes on to point out: "The Jews were dispersed long before

---

* This question will also be dealt with in detail further on.

the collapse of the Jewish State; indeed, at the opening of the Christian Era, there are said to have been about 700,000 Jews in Palestine out of something like four millions in the Roman Empire alone."[20]

In *The Ancient World* Vincent M. Scramuzza and Paul L. MacKendrick write that 40 per cent of the 500,000 population of Alexandria were Jews.[21] The two American historians mention an interesting fact: after one of the clashes between the Jewish and Greek communities in Alexandria caused by their economic and political rivalry, the Roman Emperor Claudius "ordered the Greeks to respect the liberties Augustus had guaranteed to the Jews, and he warned the Jews neither to agitate for more privileges . . . nor to encourage clandestine immigration of Palestinian Jews into Egypt".[22]

The rise of new Jewish communities went on just as intensively in the period of the expansion of the Arab Caliphate (7th century A.D.). It is common knowledge that the sovereigns of the empires which succeeded each other in the Mediterranean region brutally oppressed and exploited all the peoples they conquered, including the Jews. But, it is an historical fact that the appearance of the Arab Caliphate brought about the revival of the old Jewish community in Baghdad that had been dragging out a miserable existence in the Hellenistic age. Historian Cecil Roth shows in his *History of the Jews* that this community developed into a spiritual centre of the Jews living inside and outside the Caliphate.[23]

According to the authors of *The Cambridge Medieval History*, this period also witnessed the intensive settlement of Jewish communities in Spain, Egypt and Mesopotamia, that is, in the most flourishing provinces of the Caliphate, and the Jews had few rivals as traders in the 9th century A.D. There is evidence of them being constantly on the move between the kingdom of the Franks and China. "Ibn Khurdadhbih, the Postmaster of the Caliphate of Baghdad, gives in his *Book of the Ways* (c. 847) a remarkable picture of the activities of the so-called 'Radanite' Jewish traders, from China to Spain, in the ninth century. . . . 'Jew' and 'merchant' are used as almost interchangeable terms."[24]

The historical facts point to the repetition of a situation vexing for the Zionists in each successive age: the routes along which, according to their view, the "idea of returning"

to Palestine should have led the Jews from Babylonian times onwards, just did not coincide with the trade routes of the Jewish communities scattered throughout the world.

As we have already noted, prior to the Middle Ages wealthy traders played the leading role in the Jewish communities and the class composition of these communities did not differ from that of society as a whole. The Jewish hierarchy was vitally concerned with preserving the communities and did so with the help of the synagogue, which had first appeared in Babylon. It should be added that in the Hellenistic age, in the period of Roman domination and throughout the existence of the Arab Caliphate, Jewish communities enjoyed full autonomy in their internal affairs since this was in the interests both of the community hierarchies and of the imperial ruling circles.

As Nathan Ausubel rightly notes, self-government was of particular benefit to the governing strata of the communities in the matter of tax collecting (this being at the same time a matter of direct interest to the imperial ruling classes—*Y.I.*) and also as a means of forcibly imposing their own laws and regulations in the ghetto.*[25]

In the opinion of many bourgeois historians the Jewish communities which settled in numerous countries before the Middle Ages were commercial associations. But as we see it, this conclusion is correct only insofar as it concerns the wealthy upper crust whose activity mainly determined the character of the communities and who, by virtue of economic dependence and relative isolation, were served by all members of the community representing the most diverse classes.

We can only speak of very relative isolation of the Jewish colonies before the Middle Ages. (Those who conceived the myth about the antiquity of Zionism as an "ever-present longing" to return to Palestine tried to turn even this to their advantage and formulated a thesis about the racial purity of the Jews, their spiritual unity rising above "class prejudices" and the urge of the Jews to remain just as they are in the name of their forthcoming "return to holy Zion".)

Two tendencies clashed in the life of the Jewish communities in those times—the natural tendency of members

---

* Ghetto, district of a city to which members of a racial, professional or religious group are or were restricted by the ruling circles in capitalist or pre-capitalist states.

towards assimilation, and the deliberate policy of insularism pursued by the upper crust in order to further its class interests. With alternating success this struggle went on until the Middle Ages when the socio-economic conditions engendering unbridled religious fanaticism and (once again) the economic and political interests of the Jewish hierarchy led to the erection (for a short period) of truly insurmountable ghetto walls around the Jewish communities.

The following facts prove that the Jewish communities prior to the Middle Ages were far from closed and that Zionist inferences, such as "the purity of the Jewish race", partly based on this notion of "insularism" hold absolutely no water.

According to Olmstead, members of the Babylonian community with time stopped using Hebrew and adopted Aramaic.[26]

Jews living outside Palestine were divided into two large language groups, one speaking Aramaic, as did the Jews in Palestine, and the other Greek.[27]

Discussing the Hellenistic age, Cecil Roth writes: "Egypt was, at this time, the greatest centre of Hellenic culture. The Jews could not fail to be influenced by this fact. They speedily relinquished the language of their fathers in favour of Greek; they universally adopted Hellenic names.... Imitations of, and supplements to the Bible... were composed in Greek... heavily tinged with the local philosophical conceptions."[28]

The most influential Jewish community in Spain, that of Cordova, "adopted the dress, language and customs of the Arabs", according to *The Cambridge Medieval History*.[29]

One could go on and on, but these few examples should suffice.

Philo Judaeus aptly summed up the settlement of the Jews before the Christian era as follows: "And while they hold the Holy City (Jerusalem), where stands the holy Temple of the most high God, to be their Mother-city, yet those (i.e., cities of the Diaspora) which are theirs by inheritance from their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors... are in each case considered by them to be their Fatherland in which they were born and reared."[30] This was written in the first century B.C.

Karl Marx emphasised that "*Judaism has survived not in spite of, but by virtue of history*"[31] (emphasis added—*Y.I.*).

The less subtle Jewish nationalists make no bones about dubbing Marx an anti-Semite. Their more cunning brethren are continuing their efforts to reduce Marx's *concept* of "Judaism" to the *term* "huckstering", that is, bourgeois huckstering practiced exclusively within the framework of capitalist epoch which Marx studied.*

Evidently these word-jugglers believe that their fraud will go unnoticed.

Let us recall what Marx wrote: "Judaism has persisted *alongside* of Christianity not only as a religious criticism of Christianity, not only as the embodiment of doubt in the religious parentage of Christianity, but equally because Judaism has maintained itself, and even received its supreme development, in Christian society."[32]

But of course something can only be said to persist provided it has existed up to the moment when the question of its continued existence or disappearance arises. Consequently, the concept "Judaism" (emphatically not to be qualified simply as "bourgeois huckstering") steps across the temporal border of capitalist society and recedes into the ages.

The term "huckstering" is so adequately defined in the German language that if necessary it can be used to characterise all the activities conducted by Phoenecian, Armenian, Jewish and other traders of the pre-capitalist epoch. Marx, however, does not do this. Indeed, one of the reasons why Zionists hate Marx is the fact that apart from having a collective implication, the concept "Judaism" he introduces contains a definite, accusatory characterisation of the activity (as the most typical huckstering) of the rulers of Jewish communities, the direct bearers of Judaism.

"It must not be imagined, however," writes Cecil Roth, "that the origin of the Jewish settlement in Europe was due entirely to the slave element. Commerce is a factor more potent, though not always more prominent, than warfare."[33]

By the beginning of the Middle Ages Jewish settlements appeared in most European countries. It is difficult to attribute this to the persecution of the Jews, as Zionists are inclined to do, for it is known that the Ottoman Empire,

* A question which should attract the attention of Marxist scholars is the mistranslation into some languages of the term "Judentum" used by Marx.

which had become firmly established by that time, was hospitable to all those who were persecuted in Europe on religious grounds.

The American Zionist historian, Ben Halpern, asserts that during the Ottoman period subjects of the Sultan "moved freely in and out of Palestine from other parts of the far-flung Empire, from North Africa to the Balkans.... The Ottoman Empire was hospitable, moreover, to refugees from Christian Europe. But the Jewish immigrants and residents were drawn to Constantinople, Damascus, or Cairo, where economic and political conditions were far more favourable, rather than to Palestine."[34]

Many bourgeois historians hold that trade had been replaced by moneylending as the chief economic activity of the leaders of the Jewish communities in Medieval Europe.

In the 6th century A.D. the Christian Church forbade the lending of money at interest. In the 12th century the laws prescribing punishment for moneylending became particularly severe (the Muslim Church also outlawed such financial operations).[35] Therefore, according to *The Cambridge Medieval History* "though the success of these regulations was imperfect, they nevertheless tended to throw the business of moneylending more and more into the hands of those to whom canonical prescriptions did not apply",[36] in other words, into the hands of the Judaists.*

Medieval laws in many countries prohibited Jews from joining trade guilds, and this too caused the hierarchy of the Jewish communities to turn to moneylending; the character of the Jewish communities, as we have said earlier, was determined by the activity of their prosperous upper crust served by numerous dependent co-religionists who had nothing to do with the activity and machinations of the ruling class.

"The principal householders, indeed, might be financiers," says *The Cambridge Medieval History*. "These would represent, however, only a small proportion of the total numbers. Dependent upon them, directly or indirectly, there would necessarily be numerous subordinates—agents and clerks—to help in their business; synagogal officials to carry out divine worship; scribes to draw up their business documents and to

---

* "The just man loves money more than his own flesh.... Carry thy money with thee" (*Sota XIIa, Baba mezia. 42a*).

copy out their literary or liturgical compositions; tutors for the instruction of their children; physicians to care for their sick; attendants to perform household services . . . butchers and bakers to prepare their food in accordance with ritual requirements. . . ."[37]

The socio-economic order in feudal Europe that accounted for the high degree of differentiation and seclusion of social groups within each class (not to mention classes as a whole), was mainly responsible for the strict isolation of Jewish communities and the erection of the almost insurmountable ghetto walls around them.

It should be noted that the community hierarchy did not oppose the establishment of such economic, social and physical isolation, for it provided the opportunity for "maintaining the Jewish religion *and all that this religion embraced*"[38] (emphasis added—*Y.I.*).

According to the British Zionist historian H. M. Sachar, ". . .the first Spanish and Sicilian ghettos of the early medieval era were actually requested by the Jews themselves. . . ."[39] Quoting Salo Baron, A. Lilienthal, US historian and publicist, wrote that the rabbis insisted on separatism on political and religious grounds; therefore the basic laws regulating ghetto life in Portugal were passed at the request of Jews living there.

Jewish communities in Britain, France, Germany and other European countries enjoyed the "protection" of the monarchs who had a vested interest in their existence and activity since the taxes levied on them flowed directly into the royal coffers. "The average revenue derived from the Jews in northern countries," notes *The Cambridge Medieval History*, "has been reckoned at about one-twelfth of the total royal income."[40]

Religious persecution of the Jews in the Middle Ages was largely due to economic motives. T. Geilikman, a contributor to the *Bolshaya Sovietskaya Entsiklopediya*, makes the following observation: "Not content with levying enormous taxes on the Jews, the royal authorities did as they pleased with the promissory notes issued in their name. At the end of the reign of Henry II, for example, the property of Aaron Lincoln, one of the wealthiest Jewish bankers whom the king owed £100,000 stg., was seized by the royal treasury together with the promissory notes and mortgage deeds on land issued in the former's name. The attitude of the ruling classes . . .

to the Jews became particularly manifest during the pogrom on the eve of the Third Crusade (1190), when the English nobility, debtors of Jewish moneylenders, burned their promissory notes."[41]

T. Geilikman further notes that "in the 13th century Lombard competition abolished the need for Jewish capital.... Towards the close of the century the Church increased its opposition to the Jews and in 1290 all of them were expelled from England by a decree of Edward I".[42]

However, the migration routes of the Jews in the Middle Ages following the persecution of the Jewish communities in Portugal, Spain, England and some other countries are rather disappointing for the Zionists. As Cecil Roth writes, while in the 8th and 9th centuries the Euphrates Valley was the centre of the Jewish religion, by the 16th century it had shifted to Poland.[43]

Though fully acquainted with these facts, the Zionists (especially in matters pertaining to the Middle Ages), nevertheless, intruded into a sphere from which orthodox rabbis in some countries, including Israel, to this day are trying to evict them. Unable to manipulate with respect to the Middle Ages such terms as "Babylonian captivity" or "the second destruction of the Temple by the Romans", they seized upon the Messianic idea—the idea of the "arrival of the Messiah and the return of the exiled"—asserting that on the one hand this idea "is an expression of the national spirit of the Jews" and, on the other, "confirmation of their ever-present longing to return to Palestine".

But here the theologian Manasseh Ben-Israel (1606-1657) makes the Zionists uncomfortable. Having in mind the idea of the arrival of the Messiah, he asked Cromwell to permit Jewish communities to return to England. He reasoned approximately as follows: there has been no Messiah so far; God alone knows when he will arrive, but the Holy Scripture says that before returning to the "Holy Land", the Jews have to be scattered all over the world, something which cannot be considered as accomplished, since there are no Jews in England.[44] The Jews were then allowed to return to England.

The idea of the arrival of the Messiah, adopted from Judaism by the Christian religion and Islam (as in its time Judaism had adopted its basic concepts from Zoroastrianism), was formulated, as has been repeatedly proved, to

perpetuate the class society and the system of exploitation and thus deprive the exploited of the hope of ever being able to wage a successful struggle for a better future. The Zionists, however, are endeavouring to present the idea of the arrival of the Messiah as a symbol of the intellectual and physical attachment of the Jews to Palestine, as evidence of their "ever-present longing".

Emotional attachments—especially where millions of people living on different continents, speaking different languages and subjected to the most diverse influences are involved—are a sphere upon which we shall refrain from encroaching, as the Zionists are brazenly doing, let alone from making any categorical statements about.

As regards physical attachment to Palestine, it did exist as the facts show, but in a somewhat discouraging (for the Zionists) form: according to regulations it was necessary for adherents to the Jewish faith to own land in order to be able to engage in financial operations. Therefore, some early Babylonian teachers enacted "*an ordinance (taqqanah), enabling Jewish businessmen to use for that purpose the ideal claim of each Jew to the possession of four ells of Palestinian soil*"[45] (emphasis added—*Y.I.*). Subsequent events connected with the "Babylonian captivity" are known.

"While great world tensions ... added new zest and immediacy to messianic speculations ... in more quiescent periods there was less urgency in messianic appeal, and some individuals may even have begun to doubt its necessity for the preservation of the Jewish faith," wrote Salo Baron.[46]

Let the Zionists continue their polemic over this issue with orthodox rabbis and Salo Baron.

From Poland, Jewish communities began to migrate to Russia—another disappointment for the proponents of the idea of the ever-present longing for Palestine. According to A. M. Hyamson, out of the millions of Jews in the world, "there were not more than about 5,000 Jews in Palestine in 1770".[47] At that time the number of subjects of Jewish origin in Russia alone was many times greater.

Russian tsarism subjected the Jewish poor, as it did other national groups and peoples, to repressions and brutal exploitation. The tsarist authorities established what was known as the Jewish pale. The history of the creation of the pale is described by T. Geilikman.

"In their petition," he writes, "Moscow merchants complain that the Jews 'engage in retail trade in foreign commodities which they themselves bring in from abroad and sell below market prices, thus causing considerable damage and disruption to local commerce. The sale of commodities at lower prices than charged by all Russian merchants is a clear indication of smuggling and evasion of taxes'." Moscow merchants, Geilikman continues, did not even think it necessary to mask their plea with the fig leaf of religion. On the contrary, they emphasise that they are pleading to forbid the Jews to trade, to exile those that had already settled in Moscow and to expel those that had clandestinely joined the Moscow merchants "not because of any aversion or hatred for their religion" but solely because of the material damage they are causing. They did not petition in vain: Yekaterina II conceded that "the Jews had the right to join the merchants only in Byelorussia, Yekaterinoslav Vice-regency and the Tauric Gubernia. It was this law (1796) that established the so-called Jewish pale".[48]

But it was not long before the Polyakovs, Ginzburgs and other magnates had overcome this barrier and installed themselves in luxurious mansions in Moscow and St. Petersburg, leaving on the other side of the pale tens and subsequently hundreds of thousands of benighted and indigent working Jews.

At this juncture it is necessary to make a slight digression. We firmly believe that to assert that any given nation, nationality or national group "suffered more than anybody else in the world throughout the history of mankind" is tantamount not only to deliberate misrepresentation of the historical facts in the interests of base nationalistic aspirations, but also deliberate adoption of an inverted racialist stand, an attempt to bread overt or veiled animosity to one and all and to sow discord.

It is this course that the Zionist leaders are pursuing in their efforts to rally together in the interests of the exploiters the Polyakovs, Oppenheimers, Rothschilds and other multimillionaires and the Jewish workers and craftsmen under the biblical panoply of "a people punished by God, yet one chosen by him" and to counterpose the Jewish working people to their non-Jewish fellows. The Zionists view the era of the Jewish pale merely as good material for unscrupulous speculation on the sufferings of the Jewish working

people (which were indeed extreme in certain historical periods and in certain countries). It merely serves them as an "argument" by which they seek to prove that "the sufferings endured by any other nation are not to be compared with those endured by the world Jewish nation in all times".

It is common knowledge that the history of wars and struggle in an antagonistic class society contains numerous descriptions of acts of brutality. Every nation preserves in its memory a succession of events characterised by violence, barbarous, bloody reprisals, calamities and privations. Therefore the professional wails of the Zionists create little impression on those who know and remember such tragic episodes as the "blinding of the Bulgars", "sitting on bones" or the transportation to America of millions of Africans in the holds of ships, some of which belonged to Jewish traders and bankers, the forbears and class brothers of the Zionists. The lot of the Jewish toilers was as unenviable as the lot of the people among whom they lived and of which they were becoming increasingly a part through common labour and joint struggle against the oppressors.

And it was not the myths of the Zionists, but the actual state of affairs that enabled Leonard Stein, discussing the years immediately prior to the rise of Zionism, to declare that for the overwhelming majority of the Jews Palestine had "long ceased to be the Palestine of concrete reality. Of its geographical position or its physical form they knew little or nothing. They were not bound to it by ties of personal affection, not haunted by memories of its sights and sounds.... The return of the exiles would assuredly be a return in the most literal sense. But it would not come as the result of human effort. It would come in God's good time with the appearance of the Messiah".[49]

In other words, Stein repeated what Philo Judaeus maintained eighteen centuries before him, and indeed it could not be otherwise, for historical facts are extremely stubborn.

The impact of the gigantic upheavals and advances in the life of the people of the whole world that accompanied the collapse of the feudal system, the rapid development of capitalism and the growth of the proletarian class in Europe, and the French bourgeois revolution, was so powerful that it shattered the medieval walls of the Jewish ghettos.

Howard Sachar writes that although in that period "most Jewish communities still managed to maintain the integrity

of their religious, educational, and judicial systems, they were, nevertheless, *on the verge of bankruptcy and open class warfare*"[50] (emphasis added—*Y.I.*).

In the age of capitalism the walls of the Jewish ghettos collapsed paving the way for the unhampered assimilation of the Jews which had been interrupted for the relatively short period of the Middle Ages.

"All over Europe," Lenin wrote, "the decline of medievalism and the development of political liberty went hand in hand with the political emancipation of the Jews, their abandonment of Yiddish for the language of the people among whom they lived, and, in general, their undeniable progressive assimilation with the surrounding population."[51]

Examining this period Leonard Stein states in his *Zionism*: "The emancipated Jews of the West could no longer regard themselves as exiles living in a world apart. They had become firmly rooted in the countries of their birth, to which they were attached, not only by political allegiance but also by the closest ties of interest and affection.... They had ceased to be simply Jews, and as Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, or whatever it might be, they went their several ways. They could no longer rest content with the old-world doctrines of the Exile and the Redemption, which envisaged the Jews as the scattered fragments of a homeless people."[52]

The rapid process of emancipation mentioned by Lenin cut through all obstacles barring its way and hit hard at Judaism, the mainstay of Jewish bankers, factory-owners and traders.

Delegates to an all-national conference of representatives of Reform Judaism held in Pittsburgh in 1885 unanimously declared: "We do not expect... a return to Palestine." Twelve years later the Central Conference of American Rabbis passed a resolution which stated a disapproval of any attempt to establish a Jewish state: "America is our Zion."[53]

Still earlier, in 1818, organs were installed in the Hamburg synagogues and hymns were sung in German in keeping with Rabbi Israel Jacobson's orders.[54] Mention of Zion had already been struck out of all prayers. "Stuttgart ... is our Jerusalem,"[55] declared a leader of Judaism in Germany.

The polarisation of forces in the Jewish communities

crumbling under the impact of developments in the new age went on at a rapid pace.

Jewish working people were among the 15,000 insurgents exiled without trial or investigation by the French authorities following the revolution of 1848. At the same time "Rothschild and Bethmann loans were extended indiscriminately to the Pope, to General Louis Eugène Cavaignac in France, who crushed worker uprisings in 1848, to Metternich in Austria".[56]

"We [Jewish workers—*Y. I.*] link ourselves up with armies of Socialism...."[57] This appeal was heard on May-day, 1892. And it was not just words: a steadily increasing number of Jewish workers was joining the strike movement in Europe and America. At the same time "the capitalist Jew called for police assistance to put down strikes, while the rabbi hastened to assist the police with sermons from the pulpit denouncing the troublemakers".

While Horatio Ginzburg, one of the owners of the Lena Goldmines whose father Yevzel Ginzburg was the "king" of Russia's drinking houses, presented gifts to the royal family in gratitude for the massacre of the "insurgent" strikers, Jewish working people living within the pale declared a strike in solidarity with the Lena workers.

Analysing the struggle of the working people in Russia against the autocracy, Lenin noted that "the Jewish emancipation movement is far broader and deeper-rooted here, thanks to the awakening of a heroic class-consciousness among the Jewish proletariat...".[58]

The foregoing adequately explains the desire of the Zionists to don the robes of antiquity. But the conclusions concerning the reasons that inspired them to invent the myth about the antiquity of Zionism would be far from complete were we to overlook other, no less important developments that have a direct bearing on the matter.

Long before Theodor Herzl & Co. advanced the idea of the "establishment of a Jewish state" other voices were heard, the voices of "genuine" Zionists who were actually not only the first to propose this idea but were also the first to produce the blueprints for colonising various parts of the world with the Jews providing the manpower to

shoulder the severe trials that would initially face the new settlers. It was these non-Jewish Zionists who propagandised this sort of "necessity" and searched for sufficiently influential Jews who could lend a "national" character to the idea of gathering and resettling people of Jewish origin.

The first Zionists were the ruling circles of colonial powers.

"Under the authority of the Dutch West India Company ... in 1652," wrote Charles P. Daly, "a tract of land ... was granted in the island of Curaçao to Joseph Nunez da Fonseca, and others, to found a colony of Jews in that island ... but it was not successful...."[59]

In 1654 England was planning to settle Jews in her colony of Surinam, and France had similar plans for Cayenne.

The first attempt to colonise Palestine by settling Jews there was made by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1799 out of strategic considerations. But it ended just as unsuccessfully as all the preceding attempts.

Commenting on this, Nahum Sokolow writes: "...but since the whole expedition [Napoleon's offensive of Syria from Egypt—*Y. I.*] proved a failure, Jewish opinion—not on the principle, but on the opportunity and the means—was divided."[60]

Shortly before Napoleon's proposed colonisation of Palestine, an anonymous letter was published in France allegedly written by a member of the Jewish community to his friend: "The country we propose to occupy shall include [liable to such arrangements as shall be agreeable to France] Lower Egypt, with the addition of a district of country, which shall have for its limits a line running from Ptolemais ... to the Asphaltic Lake, or Dead Sea, and from the South point of the Lake to the Red Sea."

Further on the anonymous author gives the following reasons for the occupation of this territory: "This position, which is the most advantageous in the world, will render us, by the navigation of the Red Sea, masters of the commerce of India, Arabia and the South and East of Africa, Abyssinia, and Ethiopia, those rich countries which furnished Solomon with so much gold and ivory and so many precious stones...."[61] The letter naturally proposed that this wealth be shared with France.

Even Sokolow concedes that the letter had been published "at the suggestion of those then in power in France. . .".[62]

If, however, the efforts of the French colonialists to use Jews to further their own interests in the Middle East can be viewed merely as an historical episode, the steps taken in this direction by the British ruling circles should be seen rather as the consistent implementation of a well-elaborated plan.

In 1840, the leading European colonial powers struggling for influence in the decaying Turkish Empire, raised the question of the future of Syria, then occupied by Egyptian troops. On August 17, 1840, *The Times* carried an article entitled "Syria—Restoration of the Jews", which said in part: "The proposition [as far as it is known, no one had tabled such a proposition—*Y. I.*] to plant the Jewish people in the land of their fathers, under the protection of the five Powers, is no longer a mere matter of speculation, but of serious political consideration."

But while *The Times* as a semi-official organ of the British Government had to be diplomatic and stress its concern for other colonialists, there were some circles in Britain which saw no reason to conceal their actual motives and views on this matter.

The Earl of Shaftesbury, a prominent British statesman, in a letter of September 25th, 1840, to Viscount Palmerston, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, wrote that it was essential to make Syria a British dominion. He underlined that this would require both capital and labour and that capital was "of too sensitive a nature to flow with readiness into any country where neither property nor life can be regarded as secure. . .". In conclusion Shaftesbury made the following point: "If we consider their [i.e., the Jews'—*Ed.*] return in the light of a new establishment or colonisation of Palestine, we shall find it to be the cheapest and safest mode of supplying the wants of these depopulated regions."[63]

The colonial powers' struggle for influence in the Middle East was extremely intense in the period immediately preceding and following the construction of the Suez Canal. Characterising their fierce rivalry in that part of the world, Dr. Edward Robinson (1797-1863) wrote: "France has long since been the acknowledged protector of the Roman

Catholic religion.... In the members of the Greek Church ... the Russians have even warmer partisans.... But where are England's partisans in any part of Turkey?"[64] England sought to secure the support of the Oriental Jews (by passing an act of protectorship over them) and to persuade the European Jews to move (under her aegis) to Palestine.

On January 25, 1853, Colonel George Gauler, former Governor of South Australia and hence an experienced colonial official, declared in Parliament: "Divine Providence has placed Syria and Egypt in the very gap between England and the most important regions of her colonial and foreign trade, India, China, the Indian Archipelago and Australia.... Hence the providential call upon her, to exert herself energetically for the amelioration of the condition of both of these Provinces ... and it is now for England to set her hand to the renovation of Syria, through the only people whose energies will be extensively and permanently in the work,—the real children of the soil, the sons of Israel."[65]

It is noteworthy that in his Pastoral Letter in 1854 Dr. N. Adler, Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, in effect opposed such appeals. He wrote that the destiny of the Jews lay in the hand of the Lord who commanded "not to stir, neither to awake His love, until He please...".[66]

But as time went on more and more people appeared who wanted to awaken Yahweh. In 1866 Henri Dunant, founder of the International Committee of the Red Cross, suggested the founding of an Eastern International Society to promote the development of Palestine "with the participation of the people of Israel". He pointed out that "influential men in France, England, and elsewhere are favourably disposed to the scheme".[67]

Such "collective ownership", however, was not calculated to suit the British. Writing at the close of his political career the Earl of Shaftesbury noted in the press: "Syria then will be a place of trade pre-eminence. And who are pre-eminently the traders of the world? Will there, when the coming change has taken place, be any more congenial field for the energies of the Jew?... And has not England a special interest in promoting such a restoration? It would be a blow to England if either of her rivals should get hold of Syria."

It is difficult to accept that a Christian pastor, the Reve-

rend James Neil, could have been unaware that according to Judaistic canons it was God himself through his Messiah who was to gather all the Jews together in the shadow of Holy Mount Zion. Not at all embarrassed by this circumstance and in compliance with the interests of the English ruling circles he wrote in 1877 in his book, *Palestine Repeopled: or Scattered Israel's Gathering*, that owing to the heat, the difficulties caused by the Arabs, lack of efficient protection and the like it was doubtful whether English people could colonise Palestine as successfully as they had North America. He suggested, therefore, that the Jews be used for this purpose.

The British Prime Minister Herbert Asquith wrote in his diary that his successor Lloyd George used roughly the same logic. Describing a discussion of one of the numerous plans for gaining possession of Palestine, Asquith observed: "Curiously enough, the only other partisan of this proposal is Lloyd George, who I need not say does not care a damn for the Jews or their past or their future, but thinks it will be an outrage to let the Holy Places pass into the possession or under the protectorate of . . . 'atheistic France'."[68]

In the 1870s the Syrian and Palestine Colonisation Society was founded in England "to promote the colonisation of Syria and Palestine and the neighbouring countries by persons of good character, whether Christians or Jews".[69] The time was ripe for the emergence of Zionism: the time had come when, as the early 20th century Zionist leader Max Nordau put it, if Zionism had not existed "Great Britain would have had to invent it".[70]

As we have seen the World Zionist Organisation was founded in 1897. In 1902 the Jewish Colonial Trust was created, an international Zionist joint-stock company, which according to Nahum Sokolow "is the financial instrument of the Zionist movement, and its main object is the industrial and commercial development of Palestine and the neighbouring countries".[71]

Commenting on these developments, he wrote: "All the great achievements of British peaceful [?] conquests encouraged the Zionist Movement with its trusts and funds. Cecil Rhodes, with only a million pounds to start with, created Rhodesia with its 750,000 square miles. The British North Borneo Company has a capital of £800,000 and dominates over 31,000 square miles. The British East African

Company, which administered 200,000 square miles, began with the same amount as the Jewish Colonial Trust, namely £250,000."[72]

At first the Jewish Colonial Trust issued shares to the sum of £2,000,000. A great deal of noise was raised around this Zionist colonial undertaking. Zionist leaders went out of their way to advertise their newly created corporation calling it "pan-national Jewish" offspring and property. But this was nothing more than ballyhoo intended for the credulous.

In the light of Nahum Sokolow's unambiguous admissions, it is perfectly clear that Zionism did not appear as a movement, and least of all a popular movement, but as a capitalist enterprise. The shareholders in the new corporation were wealthy dealers from many countries and their salesmen were Zionist leaders. Organisationally Zionism took shape as a colonial enterprise closely connected with imperialist circles, its needs served by the international association of Zionists.

It was this state of affairs that enabled Baron Edmond de Rothschild to declare shortly before the First World War that but for him the Zionists would not have moved a step, and that at the same time without the Zionists his efforts would have been futile.

Zionism appeared as a phenomenon alien not only to the Jewish working people who were struggling together with the working class of their countries for a better future, but for the overwhelming majority of people of Jewish origin living in all parts of the world. It was this circumstance that enabled Leonard Stein to assert: "To the emancipated Jews, who desired nothing so little as to attract unnecessary attention, he [the Zionist—*Y. I.*] was an *enfant terrible.* To the Reformers, who saw in Zionism, not a mere inconvenience, but a menace to spiritual values which they sincerely prized, he was equally obnoxious. To the ultra-Orthodox, at the opposite side of the scale, he was little better than an unbeliever engaged in a presumptuous attempt to force the hand of the Almighty."

Nevertheless, Zionism did make its appearance. What were the basic reasons? Let us briefly formulate them here, by way of a summary of the foregoing.

1. Rivalry between Britain and France (and later Germany too, following her national consolidation) in the

Middle East, which was still within the boundaries of the rickety Ottoman Empire, and the struggle for its final partitioning compelled each colonial power (well aware by the turn of the century that the days of unrestrained colonisation were over and each fresh "colonial acquisition" was likely to provoke sharp military counter-measures by its rivals) to find plausible excuses for expanding its sphere of influence.

The idea of resettling the Jews in Palestine (and, as we shall see, into any country that happened to be of immediate interest), long since nourished by British ruling circles, appeared to provide the best possible opportunity for "respectable" colonisation. (Even Bismarck, who intended to settle the Jews along the Berlin-Baghdad Railway, planned to use this idea.) Such projects, however, could not be carried out without human resources, which England for one for many years sought in vain to secure.

Consequently, the British, French and German imperialists were definitely interested in assisting the forces prepared to carry out the mutually advantageous enterprise of colonising Palestine, or, like Bismarck, other parts of the Ottoman Empire.

2. The exacerbation of the class struggle at the turn of the century forced imperialism to consolidate and support all forces that in one way or another opposed the international proletarian movement, class solidarity and the struggle of all working people.

It follows, therefore, that the rulers of all the major European states without exception were objectively interested in a phenomenon such as Zionism.

3. The process of class differentiation, the disintegration of the Jewish communities, and the desire of the Jewish working people in all countries to throw off the control of community leaders led people from the upper strata of the communities to coalesce in order to re-establish and consolidate their erstwhile hegemony in any form, and thus establish full control over the Jewish working masses.

Consequently, there were also concrete political prerequisites for the formation of the World Zionist Organisation.

In other words, Zionism arose as an attempt of the pro-imperialist Jewish bourgeoisie to re-establish the control (now by bourgeois sections) lost by the leaders of the Jewish

communities over the Jewish masses, to retard "their undeniable progressive assimilation with the surrounding population" (Lenin), to create in each country and on an international scale a political and physical reserve capable of being utilised in the interests of Zionism's chief ally and senior partner, namely, the strongest imperialist power at a given time. This attempt found its embodiment in the Jewish Colonial Trust and the World Zionist Organisation.

Plainly the "Jewish state" slogan acquired, in the concrete conditions of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a purely "instrumental" nature. Zionist leaders had never viewed the creation of a "Jewish state" as an end in itself, but as a means for attaining other, bigger goals—the re-establishment of control over the Jewish people, the greatest possible enrichment for the sake of power and parasitical prosperity, and the defence and consolidation of imperialism.

The myth of the antiquity of Zionism which is being spread to this day was conceived for the purpose of concealing the actual class content of Zionism, its real aspirations and designs, erasing from the memory of people the real date of its birth and the causes that engendered its rise, and convincing the Jews in all countries that Zionism was what they had wanted all their lives, although, for some reason, they failed to realise it.

Chapter II

"A TIME TO CAST AWAY STONES, AND A TIME TO GATHER STONES TOGETHER"*

Some time ago US scientist George R. Tamarin, who had lived for many years in Israel, conducted an experiment which yielded eloquent and significant results.

He compared the written replies to 1066 questionnaires on *The Book of Joshua* (which is taught in Israeli schools from forms four to eight) sent to him by 563 boys and 503 girls studying in various forms of various schools in Israel.

"You are well acquainted," ran the questionnaire, "with the following passages of *The Book of Joshua*: 'So the people shouted when the priests blew with the trumpets: and it came to pass, when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, and the people shouted with a great shout, that the wall fell down flat, so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and they took the city. And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword. (VI, 20, 21.) And that day Joshua took Makkedah, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof he utterly destroyed, them, and all the souls that were therein; he let none remain in it; but did unto the king of Makkedah as he did unto the king of Jericho. . . .' (X, 28-30.)

"Please answer the following two questions:

"1. Do you think Joshua and the Israelites acted rightly or not? Explain why you think as you do.

"2. Suppose that the Israeli Army conquers an Arab village in battle. Do you think it would be good or bad to act towards the inhabitants as did Joshua towards the people of Jericho (and Makkedah)? Explain why. . . ."

* *Ecclesiastes.*

Further Tamarin wrote: "Joshua's genocide is not the only one of its type mentioned in the Bible. We selected this particular example because of the special position *The Book of Joshua* has in the educational system. . . ."[1]

This questionnaire was circulated in schools in Tel Aviv, in a village near Ramle, in Sharon, in the kibbutz Meuchad, and other places.

Here are some of the answers. A schoolboy from Sharon wrote: "The objective of the wars was the conquest of the country for the Israelites. Therefore, the Israelites acted well in conquering the cities and killing the inhabitants. It is undesirable to have a foreign enclave in Israel: The people of the different religion could have influenced the Israelis. . . ."[2]

"Joshua acted well in killing the people of Jericho," wrote a schoolgirl from the kibbutz Meuchad, "since he still had the whole country to conquer, and did not have time to spend on prisoners of war."[3]

From 66 to 95 per cent of the answers, depending on the given school, kibbutz or town, were in the same vein.

Thirty per cent of the answers to the second question were categorically in favour of wiping out the inhabitants of a captured Arab village.

This is the sort of thing the children wrote: "I think it was good because we want our enemies to be conquered, and to widen our frontiers, and we would kill Arabs as Joshua and the Israelites did."[4] (Form Seven.)

"In my opinion," wrote an eight-form pupil, "the Israeli Army has to act in an Arab village as Joshua acted, since the Arabs are our enemy in their souls, and therefore, even if they would be in captivity they would look for any opportunity to kill their guards."[5]

These are just some of the fruits of Zionist "education" and they did not grow on their own, but on the deeply rooted tree of Zionist ideology which we shall examine in this chapter.

"Can we possibly attribute to chance," Lenin wrote in 1903, "the fact that it is the reactionary forces all over Europe, and especially in Russia, who *oppose* the assimilation of the Jews and try to perpetuate their isolation?"[6]

The way in which the question was posed indicated that Lenin did not consider it a coincidence.

The walls of the medieval ghettos which enabled the leaders of the Jewish communities to control the Jewish masses collapsed; Judaism, the spiritual ghetto, succumbed to the massive blows of the new times and the forces directly concerned with preserving at least a fraction of their influence and control, a part of their erstwhile hegemony, directed their efforts to bringing to life new spiritual and organisational forms of the ghetto that would be in keeping with the times and ensuring their efficacy.

One of the organisational forms was the Zionist concern in the form of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Colonial Trust, while Zionist ideology became one of the new forms of the spiritual ghetto.

In the latter half of the 19th century 86.5 per cent of the Jews resided in Europe,[7] and in each European country there arose among Jews and non-Jews alike forces that in Lenin's words favoured the undeniable progressive assimilation of the Jews with the surrounding population, and those opposing this process.

"There is no other country to which we would be devoted as we are to this country. What other homeland calls on us to defend it? We did not emigrate to Germany, but were born here. Thus, either we are Germans or we are homeless. There is only one consecration to nationality, and that is blood spilled in common struggle for the freedom of the land of one's birth."[8] Uttered at the close of the last century, these words were a challenge to Prussian anti-Semites and mirrored not only the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the Jews, but also constituted their way of thinking.

"Gentile opponents of Jewish emancipation," wrote historian Ben Halpern, "could not directly defend the religious discrimination that existed under the *ancien régime*. Hence, they developed an argument against granting citizenship to the Jews that could be defended in terms of liberal principles, contending that the Jews constituted ... a *separate nation from the majority in the countries where they lived*"[9] (emphasis added—*Y.I.*).

It was this idea, the idea of the "Jewish nation", which, as Lenin insisted, was absolutely false and reactionary in content, that directly or indirectly communicated to the Jewish working people a mood of hostility towards assimilation, a "ghetto" mood,[10] that became both the point of

departure for anti-Semites and the mainstay of all Zionist ideological and theoretical edifices.

The concept of a "world Jewish nation", which the Zionists have used and are still using today to impose their ideological and political control over people in different countries, should not be confused with the problem of the Israeli nation (examined in later chapters). These questions occupy totally different planes, and it would be quite wrong to seek to connect them in any way. Thus many English and Irish have long since become Australians or New Zealanders, just as many Ukrainians, Frenchmen, Jews and Russians have become Canadians, acquiring all the specific traits of the given nation.

Let us examine the more typical arguments advanced by Zionist ideologues* in support of the idea that irrespective of the country where they might be living people of Jewish origin are part of a "world Jewish nation".**

"The most touching point about these Hebrew prayers," writes Moses Hess,*** one of the early ideologues of Zionism, "is that they are really an expression of the collective Jewish spirit; they do not plead for the individual, but for the entire Jewish race.... The 'new' Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserter in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race, and even his family."[11]

Gradually, as if it were something that automatically

---

* In this chapter we shall examine the views and concepts of the most prominent Zionist theoreticians, since these are being used by world Zionism in the form in which they were originally conceived.

** Caring little for the truth and being more concerned with increasing the confusion over the question of the content of Zionism, bourgeois students of the so-called Zionist movement describe it as a sum total of diverse and even antagonistic trends which "appeared independently of one another". They distinguish between the proponents of spiritual Zionism and political Zionism and talk about territorial Zionists, revisionist Zionists and so forth. Such classification, which is bound to be purely relative, can at best be of help only in studying Zionist tactics and the nature of the illusions entertained by deluded rank-and-file Zionists. Even with the best possible intentions this compartmentalisation can be established only upon ascertaining the content of Zionism as an integral phenomenon and revealing its major strategic objectives.

*** Born in Germany in 1812, Moses Hess was an ardent supporter of the assimilation of the Jews. He took part in the Revolution of 1848 and after its defeat fled to France where he soon radically changed his views. He is the author of *Rom und Jerusalem* (1862).

follows, the former "revolutionary" Moses Hess evolves the concept of a "world Jewish nation" out of the "collective Jewish spirit" in particular and Judaism as a whole.

Dealing with the same question, L. Pinsker,* another Zionist ideologue, wrote in his *Avtoemansipatsia* (Auto-emancipation) that although the Jews were not considered a nation, since they had lost its essential features, "the Jewish people ... continued to exist spiritually as a nation. The world recognised in this people a sinister ghost roaming among the living.... If fear at the sight of a ghost is inherent in many and can, to a certain extent, be attributed to his psychic world, it is not surprising that it makes itself felt at the sight of this dead, but still living nation".[12]

Pinsker writes that although the Jews are not considered a nation, they nevertheless are a nation by virtue of their "collective spirit". They are an exclusive, incomprehensible "spiritually specific nation" which arouses the apprehension of other peoples.

Ahad Ha'am, another prominent Zionist ideologue, refers to the purely biblical concept of "a chosen people" dispersed throughout the world, "entrusted by God" with a special mission.

Leon Simon believes that "it is rather the *idea* of Palestine that is the indispensable object of national attachment"[13] which makes the Jews a nation.

And finally, Martin Buber, a prominent Zionist philosopher, speaks about the extreme supernaturalness of the "world Jewish nation". He is convinced that the Jews are the only nation in the world which took shape in times immemorial simultaneously as a nation and a religious community. Moreover, the Jewish community is, from his point of view, the "crown of creation", while the "world Jewish nation" is merely natural subordinate phenomenon.

This assortment of Zionist concepts was drummed into the people from the pulpit. It was no accident that Theodor Herzl, one of the "Fathers" of Zionism, who was well aware of the utter scientific untenability of the Zionists' theoretical baggage, indicated at the outset of his activity that to propagandise Zionist ideas there was no need to

---

* L. Pinsker (1821-1891), a publicist in Russia, and a founder of Zionist ideology.

convene meetings with their inevitable empty talk. "This propaganda," he continued, "will be an integral part of worship."[14]

Confronted with the need to erect the walls of a new spiritual ghetto, the Zionists naturally had no intention of popularising Engels's proposition that the "Jewish so-called Holy Scripture is nothing more than a record of the old-Arabian religious and tribal tradition...".[15] They were occupied with other matters. Incidentally, another reason for the creation of the myth of the antiquity of Zionism, one which we did not mention in the previous chapter, was the need of the Zionist ideologues of which (diehard pragmatists at heart) they were fully aware, to identify themselves with religion even if it had lost many of its positions and was turning primarily into Reform Judaism, since it still provided a direct link for communication with a considerable (although decreasing) number of people who held to their religion while no longer believing in the sanctity of Zion.

However false it might have appeared to Judaists, Zionism's self-identification with Judaism pursued the major objective of subjugating Judaism, which was no longer able to fulfil the functions of a spiritual ghetto, and using it as an auxiliary instrument.

This intention was unequivocally indicated by the Zionists themselves. Speaking at a Zionist meeting in Cincinnati in 1914, the late Professor Solomon Schechter said: "We must have Zionism, if we want Judaism, orthodox or reform, to continue to exist. Judaism ... is in a very weak condition, not only in America, but also in Europe."[16] Needless to say, in characterising Zionism as an essential factor for preserving Judaism, the learned professor was not guided by love for the beauty of the synagogue service. He stated, plainly and simply, that the continued existence of the old form of the spiritual ghetto depends solely on the consolidation of its new form.

One of the first to warn of the possible collapse of the old forms of the spiritual ghetto and to indicate that they could be preserved only by devising new levers with which to influence people's minds was Ahad Ha'am, who wrote: "It is not only Jews who have come out of the Ghetto: Judaism has come out, too. For Jews the exodus is confined to certain countries, and is due to toleration, but Judaism

has come out (or is coming out) of its own accord wherever it has come into contact with modern culture. This contact with modern culture overturns the defences of Judaism from within, so that Judaism can no longer remain isolated and live a life apart."

Apprehensive that Judaism would be unable to develop because of an all-embracing influence of the dominant national spirit in a particular country, he continued: "When it [Judaism—*Y.I.*] leaves the Ghetto walls it is in danger of losing its essential being or—at best—its national unity: it is in danger of being split up into as many kinds of Judaism, each with a different character and life, as there are countries of Jewish dispersion."[17]

The theological excurses of Zionist theoreticians thus had a definite purpose. They were primarily an attempt to create something half way between Cecil Rhodes' colonial "theory" and the rabbi's ordinary sermon, using the former as a means of "re-orientating" the rabbis and the latter as a means of winning a following.

Although mostly educated people, familiar with the great scientific discoveries of the times, with Marx's theory of surplus value and the works of Lenin, Zionists nonetheless unashamedly pursued their talmudic studies. They had to have a church, but only as an auxiliary instrument and not as an equal ally.

Therefore, we consider as groundless the assertions that Ahad Ha'am, Pérez Smolenskin, Martin Buber and others sought to "reconcile" Judaism with Zionism, as also the attempts to portray them as equivalent forces. They were simply playing safe. Reform Judaism's citadel in the USA, one of the mightiest in the world, capitulated to Zionism as far back as the mid-1930s and not under the impact of emotional motives, but under the pressure of monopoly capital.

For people who are not to be duped by mysticism or religion, the Zionists are working out a special set of arguments in favour of the existence of a "world Jewish nation". Paying tribute to the idea of the incomprehensible and supernatural nature of the "world Jewish nation", Chaim Weizmann, Justice L. Brandeis, Nahum Sokolow, Ber Borochov and others placed direct emphasis on the "cultural community of the Jews", their "specific historical past", and their "peculiar way of thinking" which will

persist even when the Jewish "religion has long ceased to be a living force".[18] On top of that they seek to "prove" that the Jews are a "world Jewish nation" on the grounds of "the conviction of the outside world that it is a nation".[19]

In the preceding chapter we briefly reviewed the destiny of the most diverse Jewish communities mainly by quoting scholars whom even the Zionists never listed as anti-Semites. Brief as it is, this review shows that except in the most remote times there are no grounds for speaking of a Jewish "common history".

An excellent example of how futile it is to attempt to integrate the history of diverse Jewish communities is Cecil Roth's *A History of the Jews*, one of many similar works.[20]

As regards a "common culture" of the Jews, Max Nordau wrote with Herzl-like candidness that "we shall retain the European culture which we have acquired during the last two thousand years.... We can smile at the suggestion that we should become ... Asiatics. *We should just as little become Asiatics in an anthropological and cultural sense, as the Anglo-Saxons in North America have become Red Indians.* [Emphasis added—*Y. I.*] We should aim at doing in Asia Minor what the English have done in India...."[21]

In response to the ruses of the Zionists unable to conceal their desire to gather citizens of the most diverse countries under the panoply of a "world nation", Lenin polemicising with the Bund leadership which armed itself with a set of Zionist ideas, quotes Alfred Naquet as follows: "...Are the Jews a nation? Although they were one in the remote past, my reply is a categorical *negative.* The concept nation implies certain conditions which do not exist in this case.... And the Jews no longer have either a territory or a common language [this does not pertain to the Israeli nation, but to the so-called world Jewish nation—*Y.I.*].... German and French Jews are quite unlike Polish and Russian Jews. The characteristic features of the Jews include nothing that bears the imprint (*empreinte*) of nationality...."

Sharing this view Lenin adds: "All that remains for the Bundists is to develop the theory of a separate Russian-Jewish nation, whose language is Yiddish and their territory the Pale of Settlement."[22]

Prominent among the Zionist concepts of a "world Jewish nation" is Theodor Herzl's tenet conceived to impress the public at large. "A nation," he wrote, "is, in my mind, a

historical group of men of a recognisable cohesion, held together by a common enemy. Then, if you add to that the word 'Jewish', you would have what I understand to be the Jewish nation."[23]

Herzl apparently did not attach any importance to the question of the distinguishing features of a nation, otherwise he would have considered it necessary to elaborate it in greater detail. As regards the "enemy", Herzl repeatedly stressed that it had always been and would continue to be anti-Semitism.

According to Herzl's reasoning, the "Jewish nation" will cease to exist only when anti-Semitism disappears. But Zionists predict that "anti-Semitism is eternal".

So long as the "Jewish nation" owes its existence to the constant presence of its enemy (i.e., anti-Semitism) it follows that anti-Semitism is present among all peoples living side by side with the Jews. "Ah, but it's not only present," Zionists assert.

"The *nations* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*] among which the Jews live are, without exception, either overt or disguised anti-Semites."[24]

What grounds are there for this assertion? L. Pinsker reiterates that anti-Semitism is an incurable mental disease. "Judophobia," he wrote, "is a psychosis; as such it became hereditary and as a disease inherited by generations over millennia, became incurable." Building a bridge to racialism, he says that "in general no nation favours aliens and since this phenomenon has ethnic roots, no nation can be censured for it".[25]

Yet, Lucien Wolf, an English Jew, wrote that anti-Semitism was exclusively a question of European politics and its origin was "to be found, not in the long struggle between Europe and Asia, or between the Church and the Synagogue, which filled so much of ancient and medieval history, but in the social conditions resulting from the emancipation of the Jews in the middle of the 19th century".[26]

Zionists, however, were not even satisfied with a sweeping presentation of the matter. For them recognition of anti-Semitism as a socially transient phenomenon would have been tantamount to testifying to the impotence of their arguments to substantiate the existence of a "world Jewish nation". Therefore, Zionists endowed with high academic

degrees (like Chaim Weizmann) maintained with a persistence worthy of a better cause that "the one fundamental cause of anti-Semitism ... is that the Jew exists".[27]

Enlarging on this idea, he claimed: "Anti-Semitism is a bacillus which *every Gentile* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*] carries with him (wherever he goes and however often he denies it)."[28]

That was how Zionist ideologues built up the second "basic" concept of the new spiritual ghetto, the concept of "eternal anti-Semitism".

This malicious and thoroughly false concept was devised for no other reason than to blunt the class-consciousness of the Jewish working people, to make them believe that the Jewish moneybags was nearer to them in spirit and aspirations than a Russian or a German worker, to counterpose Jews to all nations as being anti-Semitic, to sow mistrust and, whenever possible, to foment enmity towards the non-Jews, and to force the Jews to bend to the will of the brand-new Messiahs (i.e., Zionists). Moreover, the concept "eternal anti-Semitism" proved to be so universal that it soon became an instrument for all those who for one reason or another wanted to separate the Jewish working people from their fellows.

Exposing this arch-reactionary invention, Lenin countered the Bundist attempts to accuse the Russian proletariat of anti-Semitism as follows:

"If, instead of flying into a foolish and comical rage at the Ekaterinoslav Committee, the Bundists had pondered a bit over this question and had consulted, let us say, Kautsky's pamphlet on the social revolution, a Yiddish edition of which they themselves published recently, they would have understood the link that *undoubtedly* exists between anti-Semitism and the interests of the bourgeois, and not of the working-class sections of the population. If they had given it a little more thought they might have realised that the social character of anti-Semitism today is not changed by the fact that dozens or even hundreds of unorganised workers, nine-tenths of whom are still quite ignorant, take part in a pogrom.

"The Ekaterinoslav Committee has risen up (and rightly so) against the Zionist fable about anti-Semitism being eternal; by making its angry comment the Bund has only confused the issue and planted in the minds of the Jewish

workers ideas which tend to *blunt* their class-consciousness."[29]

Zionists have always attached the greatest importance to implanting the idea that "anti-Semitism is eternal" in the minds of the Jewish working people. The senile Yahweh and his remiss messenger, evidently disinclined to make his appearance, could not in modern times fully live up to hopes placed in them (as we have seen, even Zionist leaders themselves admitted as much). This being the case they turned to anti-Semitism, the persecution of the Jews, making it their true god, their real hope for success and Zionism's sole stake in life.

Even before the appearance of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Colonial Trust, Herzl had already entertained the following thought: "It will hardly require much effort to activate the movement. The anti-Semites are taking care of that."[30]

Testifying before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration which sat in London in 1902, Herzl in reply to the question what could force the Jews to leave their countries and set up a Jewish state stated: "the Anti-Semites"(!).[31]

Not only did the Zionists' reasoning create the impression that they regarded anti-Semitism as a boon: the Zionist leaders themselves unequivocally announced that anti-Semitism was useful, thus paving the way for a deal with the anti-Semites which has never been violated since the establishment of the Zionist international corporation.

"In Paris," wrote Herzl in his diaries, "...I achieved a freer attitude toward anti-Semitism, which I now began to understand historically and to pardon.

"Above all, I recognised the emptiness and futility of trying to 'combat' anti-Semitism.... However, anti-Semitism, which is a. strong if unconscious force among the masses, will do the Jews no harm. I hold it to be a movement useful for the development of Jewish character."[32]

Herzl, who even in his dreams ruled out the possibility of the victory of socialism in any part of the world, frankly wrote about the usefulness and permanence of anti-Semitism unaware of the efforts which subsequently (after the October Revolution and particularly today) the Zionist propaganda machinery would have to exert to keep the still-born *canard* about Zionism being "a reply of the Jewish

toiling masses to anti-Semitism and pogroms" on the wing.

The builders of the new spiritual ghettos, however, were not content with merely proclaiming the Jews a "chosen people", an "incomprehensible", "awesome", "world Jewish nation" and qualifying as anti-Semites all peoples among whom Jews live. The Zionists erected another fortress in the form of a thesis of the racial "purity" of the Jews and, exploiting the idea of Judaism, sought to percolate it into the minds of their audiences.

L. Pinsker pushed his idea about the "nobility" of the Jewish race. "Like the Negroes, like women," he wrote, "the Jews have still to be emancipated. And it is worse for them because in contrast to the Negroes they belong to a noble race."[33]

Nahum Sokolow was even more blunt. "...Absolute purity does not exist," he wrote, "but relatively the Jews are doubtless the purest race among civilised nations...."(!)[34]

"Not only national, but even racial peculiarities are denied to the Jews by modern scientific investigators,"[35] Lenin emphasised. But the Zionists stubbornly ignored or misrepresented all that could impede their corruptive activity. As educated people they realised that to achieve their objectives they had to stake on ignorance (Church), fear (the "eternity" of anti-Semitism) and chauvinistic ambition (the "purest race among civilised nations").

The Jewish bourgeoisie created Zionist ideology for the purpose of breeding base feelings and instincts. In a public statement in 1897 Max Nordau characterised the Jews as "more industrious and more able than the average European, not to speak at all of the inert Asiatic and African...".[36]

"...We might boast of some good qualities which do not pertain to any other nation to the same extent."[37] This is a Zionist statement of the 1899 type. It will be recalled that the nazi ideologues formulated something similar at the beginning of the 1930s.

The "purest race", the "exclusive world Jewish nation" "created by God" and "doomed to eternal anti-Semitism" was to hear a great deal more from Zionist leaders. "In vain are we loyal and sometimes even over-zealous patriots," wrote Herzl; "in vain we offer the same sacrifices in blood and property as do our compatriots; in vain we are en-

deavouring to glorify our respective countries in arts and science and to augment their riches by commerce and exchange."[38]

Herzl is clearly proposing that citizens of Jewish origin residing in different countries should drop their patriotism and further the Zionist cause by acting according to the anti-Semitic thesis that Jews are an "alien element" in every state.

This blunt suggestion caused a certain amount of apprehension among Herzl's adherents. Nahum Sokolow hastily advanced a thesis of what might be called the "dual position of the Jews". "We Jews are true citizens of the States to which we belong. All interests of the country are also ours. We have no single interest which is opposed to any interest whatsoever of our country...." (This, on the one hand, while on the other....) "The Jewish national idea is not merely a historical tradition, it is a programme for outward as well as inward use. Outwardly it manifests itself in an energetic struggle for its own existence...; inwardly as a union of the Jews of all countries, rites, grades of culture and political parties on all questions which affect Jews and Judaism."[39]

However, Herzl's successor Chaim Weizmann ignored Sokolow's dualist thesis preferring to leave no doubt as to the Zionists' actual stand on this issue. Recalling his conversation with Lord Balfour during their discussion of the complaint by Richard Wagner's widow that "the Jews of Germany had captured the German stage, press, commerce and universities" Weizmann wrote: "I went on to say that I might be in agreement with Frau Wagner as to the facts, but I was in entire disagreement as to the conclusions to be drawn from them.... The crux of the Jewish tragedy was that those Jews who were giving their energy and their brains to the Germans... were enriching Germany, and not Jewry...."[40]

Incidentally, Weizmann headed the Zionist organisation in the years when it maintained close ties with the nazis, and later, in his memoirs, scoffed at the Jews who despite the nazi terror still considered Germany their homeland.

All Zionist architects erecting the new walls of a spiritual ghetto emphasised in one way or another that citizens of Jewish origin living in various countries were "in exile", that their emancipation was impossible and their equality with other nations unattainable.

The emancipation of the Jews among other nations is unrealistic, Moses Hess asserted in his *Rom und Jerusalem.* "The Jew," declared Pinsker, "is a separate element.... Jews among the people with whom they live are an alien element...."[41]

"...Even in England, where anti-Semitism is practically unknown, there is none the less a Jewish problem, because the Synagogues are empty, and the younger generation does not seem to be so Jewish as its parents, and there is a great deal of drift into assimilation and intermarriage," (!)[42] lamented Leon Simon.

So what did the Zionists offer the intimidated and the credulous? Social emancipation? Joint struggle with other peoples for a just and equal society? Such recommendations could hardly be forthcoming from the champions of "racial purity", or to be absolutely precise, from the shareholders of the Jewish Colonial Trust.

In his letter to Baron de Hirsch in June 1895, Herzl wrote: "But the petty solutions—your 20,000 Argentinians or the conversion of the Jews to Socialism—I will not accept."[43]

With his usual bluntness (now the object of great concern to his adherents) Zionist No. 1 disclosed the objectives of "all reactionary forces in Europe", as Lenin indicated, in their efforts to "consolidate the isolation of Jewry". "All our young people," Herzl wrote, "who are now between 20 and 30 will sway away from their obscure socialist trends and come to me."[44]

Here, according to the rules of logic, we have all the links in the chain of Zionist views: Judaist mysticism, the preaching of enmity to one and all, the appeal to reject patriotism, glorification of "exclusiveness" and "racial purity", anti-internationalism and anti-communism.

* * *

What then was the solution, the way "out" offered by the Zionists for the "world Jewish nation" which they themselves (and the anti-Semites) proclaimed? Did they suggest the establishment of a "Jewish state", the State of Israel? No, they did not.

Bearing in mind who it was who first advanced the idea of colonising one or other area of the world by using Jews

as a "manpower", we should also recall that organisationally Zionism took shape as the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Colonial Trust, in other words, as a capitalist enterprise. It had as its main political objective (along with counterposing the Jews to other peoples, attempts to split the revolutionary movement, establishment of a base for the activity of imperialist agents and all other ensuing consequences) the isolation of Jewry and re-establishment of control over Jewry, thus capitalising both on colonisation (once the Jewish Colonial Trust was founded) and on Jewish particularism. Reactionary forces all over Europe, and especially in Russia, were no less concerned with isolating the Jews than the Zionists were.

Zionists have always regarded the "Jewish state" merely as a means to their major ends, which they intended to achieve not by concentrating all or the majority of Jews in that state, for in that case the undertaking would no longer serve the purpose it was designed to serve by the Zionists and their patrons, who were intent on building up reserves of "blacklegs" of the revolutionary movement and other imperialist agents in various countries. The Zionists intended to set up a "centre" through which they would be able to influence the "periphery", and until the outbreak of revolutionary events in Russia, they attached no fundamental importance to exactly where this centre should be formed.

Now for a few examples of the plans for a "centre" and a periphery.

L. Pinsker considered that the migration of Jews to a "national Jewish centre" should be limited: "The number of Jews in each country should decrease only to the extent required by the economic conditions of the native population." He made the point that "a universal resettlement of the people was, of course, absolutely out of the question".[45]

According to Ahad Ha'am, the "Jewish state" was essential merely as a moral factor. He asserted that the national ego of the Jews required a spiritual and cultural centre which would be a link between the scattered communities of the Jewish people and by its spiritual influence would stimulate their efforts to build a new national life. Moreover, he believed that there should be no hurry to establish a state but that it was essential to set up an ideological centre. "Then from this centre," he wrote, "the spirit of Judaism will go forth to the great circumference, to

all the communities of the Diaspora, and will breathe new life into them and preserve their unity. . . ."[46]

In this connection Nahum Sokolow observed: Zionism strives solely for the recognition of the national character of the Jews, since they are an ethnic, historical and cultural community in the Diaspora and also in view of their common aim of bringing about a full-scale revival of national life in the land of their fathers.[47]

To this day all attempts to veil and conceal the auxiliary role of the idea of a "Jewish state" have been confined to allegations that Herzl, the principal "originator" of the "Jewish state" teaching, had never mentioned the things so clearly intimated by Pinsker and Ahad Ha'am. Having "synthesised the aspirations of all Jews", Herzl allegedly called for a "complete exodus of all Jews from the countries of their exile" and their settlement in one centre.

Once again, however, this is just not true. While posing as a new Moses calling for a "general exodus from Egypt", in his private diary Herzl admitted that what he proposed was "no more than *the regulation* of the Jewish problem, and not in any sense the emigration of all the Jews".[48]

Since the idea of the "Jewish state" was merely instrumental, auxiliary in character, the question of where the "centre of influence" would be established was, we repeat, a matter of slight importance for the Zionists. "We do not necessarily have to settle where our state life was once crushed and destroyed," wrote L. Pinsker. ". . .We need nothing more than that a strip of land should become our property. . . . To it we shall transfer our holy of holies, which was saved when our old homeland was destroyed: the idea of God and the Bible, because it was they, and they alone, not the Jordan or Jerusalem, that made our homeland a Holy Land."[49]

"If the powers agree to grant the Jewish people sovereign rights in a neutral country, the society [World Zionist Organisation—*Y.I.*] would commence negotiations concerning the country to be chosen."[50]

The imperialist powers, whose interest lay in the acquisition of some particular colonial bridgehead or other, adopted a far more serious approach to this question.

At the beginning of the 19th century some sections of the English bourgeoisie were for stepping up the colonisation of Uganda, which then included part of present-day Kenya.

And once again it was none other than Herzl who, dwelling on the issue at the Sixth Zionist Congress, declared: "...I have no doubt that the Congress, as representative of the Jewish masses, will accept this proposal with warm gratitude. The proposal is to set up an autonomous Jewish colony in East Africa with Jewish administration, a local Jewish government headed by a Jewish high official; all this needless to say under suzerain British supervision."[51]

Taking up the question of a site for a "Jewish state", Chaim Weizmann wrote that the areas offered had either a very cold or very hot climate and that their development would have required decades of work and incredible expense.[52] In other words, the projects were just not a good business proposition.

It should be noted that the leadership of the Zionist association included groups representing the interests of various imperialist powers. Zionist leader Dr. Alfred Nossig, for example, defended the interests of German imperialism which left no stone unturned in its efforts to win influence in the Ottoman Empire. According to Dr. Moshe Sneh, an Israeli political leader, Dr. Nossig with the backing of Kaiser Wilhelm II founded an independent colonial company for settling Jews in the Ottoman Empire, outside of Palestine.[53]

Two main factors influenced the eventual choice of a site for a "Jewish state". The first was the struggle (and its outcome) between various groups of Zionist leaders representing the interests of the British, French and German imperialists.

How acute this struggle was, even over what appeared to be secondary issues, had been described by Chaim Weizmann.

Shortly before the First World War, Vysotsky, Russia's tea magnate, built a technical college for young Jews in Haifa. Immediately upon its completion there arose question: whose influence, British or German, would be predominant in the college built by a Russian magnate, and, accordingly, in what language should teaching be conducted? "To understand the significance of this struggle," wrote Weizmann, "we must recall that those were the days of the 'capitulations' in Turkish territory. Every foreign institution in the corrupt and feeble Turkish Empire placed itself under the protection of a foreign country, and the European Powers

vied with each other for influence and prestige within Turkish territory. The Jews in particular were used as cat's-paws in this game of intrigue.... There was one system of Jewish schools supported by the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* of Paris, where the language of instruction was naturally French. The Germans used the *Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden* with *its* system of schools as *their* instrument of intrigue in the Near East. The language of instruction was German. England [here we observe Weizmann's personal interest in the matter, since he was as closely linked up with British imperialism as Nossig was with German imperialism—*Y.I.*] was very much behind in the general competition...." Weizmann further notes that the Haifa Technical College was placed under the protection of Dr. Zimmerman, a "Kaiser Jew" (as German Jews were called by the Zionists of British orientation); German became the language of instruction and during the voting Weizmann found himself "in a minority of one".[54]

In the long run the struggle of Zionist leaders was won by the pro-British group headed by Weizmann. This happened after a group which had long had its eye on Palestine came to the fore in British ruling circles.*

But there was another factor, another reason why the scales tipped in favour of Canaan.

In June 1905 Lenin wrote: "An uprising and armed barricade fighting in Lodz, a bloody affray in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, general strikes and shootings at workers in Warsaw and Odessa, the ignominious end of the Zemstvo deputation farce—such are the major political events of the past week....

---

* As we have already seen, at the beginning of the 20th century, certain British imperialist circles insisted on the colonisation of Uganda, in which they were fully supported by pro-British Zionists.

Accordingly, when the Seventh Zionist Congress (1905) had decided in favour of Palestine, Israel Zangwill, a pro-British Zionist, split the World Zionist Organisation and formed a parallel organisation to implement the East Africa proposal, or to set up an autonomous Jewish area elsewhere.

Following a change in orientation within British ruling circles it was none other than Zangwill who supported the colonisation of Palestine. The Jewish Territorial Organisation (the organisation he formed after the split—*Y. I.*), he declared, must not oppose any practical project; this would be not only a betrayal of the Jewish people, but of our own programme, too.

The split in the Zionist ranks was over.

"The proletariat has been in a constant state of unrest, especially since the Ninth of January, never giving the enemy a moment's respite. It is keeping up its offensive mainly in the form of strikes, while avoiding direct clashes with the armed forces of tsarism and preparing its forces for the great and decisive battle."[55]

Revolutionary forces were rapidly gathering momentum in Germany and Eastern Europe, where the overwhelming majority of Europe's 8,500,000 Jews were living. Russia's multinational proletariat, as Lenin wrote, was preparing for a "great and decisive battle". Jewish workers were fighting side by side with the Polish workers on the barricades at Lodz. In defiance of the separatist, nationalistic position of the Bundist leaders, Jewish working people in Russia increasingly gravitated towards the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party headed by Lenin, and more and more of them joined Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Polish workers in their revolutionary activity. It is likewise common knowledge that in their struggle against the revolutionary movement of the people, the reactionary forces in Eastern Europe, and particularly in tsarist Russia, staked heavily on fanning national enmity and incited clashes between workers of different nationalities. Jewish pogroms were an element in this counter-revolutionary activity of the forces of reaction.

In these conditions Zionist leaders and their allies decided that the Palestinian alternative was more acceptable for them in view of Palestine's symbolic religious appeal. They believed, as did Nahum Sokolow and Rabbi Mohilewer, that the "colonisation of Palestine was recommended as a religious duty" and that religion "should therefore be a leading factor. . .".[56] But they had a rather peculiar understanding of this factor. They calculated that the anti-Semitism of the counter-revolution, which Herzl said was "useful for the development of the Jewish character", would force a part of the Jewish population to flee Eastern Europe. And the Zionists, who staked exclusively on counter-revolution, hoped that by exploiting the religious symbol of Palestine they would be able to direct the flow of pogrom victims to the area of the Suez Canal.

But the great expectations of the leaders of the Jewish Colonial Trust came true only to an insignificant degree. Their colossal outlays on hectoring the Jews into emigrating to Palestine produced but slight results.

Refugees from the counter-revolution began to pour not into the Middle East but into the USA, where the number of Jews increased from 986,000 in 1897 to 4,500,000 by the mid-1920s. In the same period the number of Jews in Asia increased by a mere 200,000, from 400,000 to 600,000.

How did the Zionists portray the projected "Jewish state" to the Jewish working people? "...'There' everything should be organised as here, if possible," declared Theodor Herzl. He had no intention of creating illusions concerning the nature of the state conceived by the Zionists for the Jewish masses. "Rich Jews who are now forced to hide their treasures and revel behind drawn curtains," Herzl maintained, "would be able freely to enjoy life there."[57]

L. Pinsker was equally forthright. "The initiative in furthering the cause of national revival should belong to the congress of the most esteemed Jewish citizens," he wrote. "Our best forces are the financiers, scientists and practical people...." He also made the following point: "And only this directorate with the company of capitalists, as the founders of a joint-stock society to be formed later, must buy a strip of land...."

* * *

A most striking feature of the Zionist theoretical heritage, and one that is made extensive use of by present-day Zionist leaders, is its malleability.

They have always pursued only two basic objectives: re-establishment of control over Jewry and profiteering. These are the constants, so to speak, of their world outlook. As for ideological or moral and ethical principles, their stand on this matter has always been purely one of ensuring for themselves the greatest variety of "versions" of these "principles" which could be unscrupulously applied as best suits any contingency in a changing world. "Maximum Brazenness and Minimum Logic." This formula of Lenin's referring to the Bund is even more applicable to the Zionist leaders.

In his *Autoemancipation* L. Pinsker writes: "The only correct and realistic way out of the situation would be the creation of a Jewish nation—a people living on its own territory—i.e., the autoemancipation of the Jews; their emancipation as a nation among nations through the establishment of their own national home."[58]

Ahad Ha'am stressed that after the spirit of Judaism has developed to the highest degree of perfection in the national centre "it will produce men in the country who will be able, on a favourable opportunity, to establish a State...".

The "Father of Zionism" Theodor Herzl wrote a book, *The Jewish State*, to prove that it was essential to create a state, as the sole solution to all problems of the "world Jewish nation".

At the same time Nahum Sokolow categorically stated: "It has been said, and is still being obstinately repeated by anti-Zionists again and again, that Zionism aims at the creation of an independent 'Jewish State'. But this is wholly fallacious. The 'Jewish State' was never a part of the Zionist programme."[59]

Hess, Pinsker, Herzl and Weizmann, as we have seen, proceeded from the concept of the "eternity of anti-Semitism", from the circumstance, as Weizmann insisted, that the "fundamental cause of anti-Semitism... is that the Jew exists".

Simultaneously (just in case, God forbid, anti-Semitism should disappear!) another stand was worked out. Ahad Ha'am speaks of the Jewish question as having a different content in East and West and says that in the West it "is a product of anti-Semitism, and is dependent on anti-Semitism for its existence...", while in the East it "is a natural product of a real link with a culture of thousands of years, which will retain its hold even if the troubles of the Jews all over the world come to an end, *together with anti-Semitism* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*], and all the Jews in every land have comfortable positions, are on the best possible terms with their neighbours, and are allowed by them to take part in every sphere of social and political life on terms of absolute equality."[60]

We have already noted that alongside demands to cast off any and all allegiance to their countries, to throw patriotism overboard, the Zionists elaborated a concept of "dual patriotism". Some of them maintained that the Jews were a "world nation" whatever the view of the people they lived among, others declared grimly that on the strength of public opinion the Jews were a "world nation", and so forth. "A time to cast away stones and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace and a time to refrain from

embracing; a time to love and a time to hate."* In keeping with this biblical logic the ideologues of Zionism are devising a series of controversial conceptions enabling them in all circumstances to put a good face on any matter.

The birth of Zionist ideology was also the beginning of its crisis. This ideology became bankrupt long before the formation of the State of Israel, whose existence only serves as a fuller and more forceful demonstration of the poverty of Zionist theoretical pretensions.

Zionist ideas reflected nothing more than the desire of the Jewish bourgeoisie to regain control over the disintegrated Jewish communities. These ideas did not rest on the objective laws of development of class society of which the Jewish communities formed an intrinsic part, but on the subjective intention of the reactionary forces to retard the fusion of the Jewish working masses with the working people of other nationalities. Consequently, Zionist ideology was bound right from the outset to become an outlook based purely on practical requirements.**

As we have already remarked, Herzl was up in arms at the mere mention of socialism. His disciple Max Nordau regarded socialism as a symptom of decay of the same order as Nihilism and anti-Semitism.[61] But just a few years after the establishment of the World Zionist Organisation, when the process of "modernisation" of biblical testaments was at its height, the Zionist corporation made an effort to appear before the Jewish working people, particularly those of Eastern Europe, in a "revolutionary", "socialist" garb.

"The Jewish State must be a Socialist State if it is to be realised. Zionism must fuse with Socialism in order to become the ideal of the entire Jewish people: of the proletariat, of the middle class, of the intellectuals, as well as of the idealists [i.e., capitalist idealists—*Y.I.*]," writes S. Levenberg. "Fusing with Socialism, Zionism can be raised to a great national passion. The hope for a Messiah, always the basic sentiment of the Diaspora Jew, will be converted into a political fact."[62]

Such an unnatural turn, above all from the viewpoint of the founders of Zionism, was dictated by practical necessity.

---

* *Ecclesiastes.*

** See Marx's characterisation of Judaism.

"Because of the structure of Jewish economic life," wrote H. M. Sachar about the first decade of the 20th century, "... the socialism of the cities [and this is not surprising—*Y.I.*], proved to be the principal magnet for politically minded Jews."[63]

The revolutionary movement in 1905, wrote Maurice Edelman, the author of Ben-Gurion's political biography, was a movement of protest against the way the people were denied elementary human rights. The principles of this movement also embraced Jewry.[64]

These statements were indirect recognition of the patently obvious fact that the mounting tide of the revolutionary movement in Central and Eastern Europe was sweeping up increasing numbers of Jewish working people, while the Zionist Ark and its not too numerous dwellers were left high and dry on the rocks. It was these circumstances that forced the Zionists to hasten the elaboration of "theories" of Zionist "socialism" or "socialist" Zionism. And one of the first to try his hand in this field was our "old friend" Nahum Sokolow.

He began in a very un-Zionist way by making a class analysis and recognising the role played by the working people. He also advanced the theory that the Jewish working people may be divided into two categories, one nationally indifferent category with which class interest alone carries weight and another which could be classified as nationally firm. The latter occupies a very distinctly noticeable separate position although it holds together with other workmen in the struggle for higher wages and general improvement of living conditions.[65]

Calling upon the Zionists to consolidate their positions among the workmen of the "second category" and through it infiltrate the first, Sokolow wrote: "The workmen if they became Zionist would, so to say, constitute the solid effective force which could be relied upon at any moment."[66] Continuing, he asserts: "The Jewish workmen are the natural allies of Zionism, but they will become the actual and co-operating allies only through independent [Zionist—*Y.I.*] workmen organisations."[67] Conceding, even if indirectly, that Zionism is alien to the working people, he laid special emphasis on the need to work unceasingly to split the working class. "Although it is not out of love for Zionism that the Jewish workmen ... feel nationally," he wrote, "they may

yet in time become national even in a Zionist sense. And that through the natural community of interests, passing from the unconscious to the conscious. . . ."[68]

In other words, Sokolow was trying to say that it was no use waiting for things to drop into your lap and was summoning the Zionists to work with the utmost persistence to split the ranks of the Jewish workmen, thus isolating them from the general army of workers fighting for their emancipation as a class. "To the principle of evolution Zionist Judaism also holds fast . . . ," he added.[69]

Another well-known theoretician of Zionist "socialism" was Ber Borochov who wrote: "Mankind is divided into nations and classes. Nations existed before they were split into classes. Nations remain while classes change. . . . The nations underwent cultural modifications, but in essence they remained the same. . . ."[70] Step by step Borochov leads the reader into believing that the Jews even though dispersed throughout the world, are nevertheless a single nation.

Hence it is clear that the Trojan horse of "socialist" Zionism did not roam for long on virgin soil. The last link in the chain was being forged. "For hundreds of years the Jewish masses have blindly searched for a way that will return them to the soil. At last we have found it. *Zionism is the way*. . . ."[71] Drawing on Ahad Ha'am, the "socialist" Borochov anticipated the conclusions of the mystic Martin Buber. ". . .Nation—from days immemorial. . . ."

"He [the worker—*Y.I.*] sees the colonisation of the country [Palestine—*Y.I.*], and the growth of the working class as mutually interdependent," Borochov's followers assert. "His class consciousness is not fed by narrow egoistic interests which are alien to and incompatible with the interest of the nation as a whole. . . ."[72] In other words, there are "our" workers and "alien" workers, the latter being class egoists while the former are complaisant people, and, as Jews, should understand the community between them and other Jews who happen to be capitalists.

It should be noted that "socialist" Zionists are by no means original. They are simply touching up the barely perceptible rose tinge of Herzl, the monarchist, who wrote: "In the ghetto we were gradually transformed into a kind of middle class, which subsequently became a formidable rival of the Christians of the same middle class. Thus, after the emancipation we found ourselves among the bourgeoisie. . . . The

Christian bourgeoisie, of course, would have gladly delivered us over to socialism. But it would have gained very little by so doing.... As a matter of fact, nothing effective can be undertaken against us. There was a time when the Jews were relieved of their jewels. But how can they be deprived of their movable property today when it consists of pieces of paper kept in all parts of the world, perhaps even in Christian safes.... At the bottom we are becoming proletarianised and are providing all the subversive parties with non-commissioned officers, while our redoubtable financial strength is increasing up at the top. We are an historical group which is easily recognisable in its cohesion...."[73]

No, it was certainly no accident that "reactionary forces all over Europe, and especially in Russia", including all those taking part in the Zionist masquerade, from "Zionist talmudists" to "socialist Zionists", worked so stubbornly to isolate the Jews in an era when it was a question of who would be on one side of the revolutionary barricades and who on the other.

Despite the smokescreen created by the Zionists and their ideological brethren the crux of the matter was whether the Zionists and other Jewish nationalists would succeed (with the help of the anti-Semites) in turning the Jewish workmen in all countries where Jews resided into an element "conscious of being alien and isolated", into a reserve of the bourgeoisie, a source of agents for imperialism, or whether the revolutionary movement and the international class solidarity of the working people in their struggle against the common enemy, the exploiter class, would rise as an insurmountable obstacle to such efforts. In other words, in each country the issue turned upon the outcome of the struggle between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces. Zionism represented and continues to represent an active force of counter-revolution.

It was only natural that the initiators of the Jewish Colonial Trust should have found themselves in the counter-revolutionary camp. The socialist revolution, the very idea of which was hateful to Theodor Herzl, the first President of the World Zionist Organisation, who openly defamed socialism, became a symbol of imminent catastrophe for his followers who had witnessed the portentous events of 1905. Hence the haste with which Zionists transferred

their ideological booby traps from small town market places and synagogues to workshops, railway depots, and factories.

More than 60 years after the first attempts of the Zionists to gain control over Jewish workers, and particularly over Jewish workers in Russia, and fifty years after the Great October Socialist Revolution, which turned to dust all the so-called theories of "socialist Zionism", on September 4, 1967 Kol-Israel, the overseas Radio Israel service, endeavouring to whitewash Zionist theoreticians and politicians, broadcast the following:

"Not only does the national principle of Zionism not clash with socialist ideology, but, on the contrary, Zionism seeks to fuse the ideas of the national emancipation of the Jews and the ideas of social emancipation of the exploited masses into a single movement. It was a combination of socialism with the Zionist national liberation movement that served as a foundation for the programme of the Zionist workers' party Poalei Zion approved at the first All-Russia Congress of the party held in Poltava, in 1906. This programme was drawn up by Ber Borochov.... The essence of the main thesis of socialist Zionism was that *neither a normal, fully socialist, nor a national-autonomous development of the masses was possible for the Jews living in the countries of the Diaspora, whatever regimes might be established in them*" (emphasis added—*Y.I.*).

It only remains to be asked: on what incredibly, phenomenally gullible audience could the authors of such candid self-exposing assertions be counting?

Kol-Israel in its own words outlined the programme of the Minsk Committee of Poalei Zion which stated: "The Russian Revolution has no relation to the struggle for our future since it will not resolve the Jewish question even for the Jews residing in Russia and will not bring us closer to Zionism."[74] In this connection Zubatov, head of the Moscow division of the tsarist secret political police, wrote to the Police Department: "We should support Zionism, and, in general, turn nationalistic aspirations to our advantage."[75]

Defining the activity of Poalei Zion which the Zionists, on the basis of Borochov's ideas, had turned into an international organisation, the Executive Committee of the Communist International pointed out: "The theme of Palestine, the attempt to divert the Jewish working masses from the class struggle by propaganda in favour of large-scale Jewish

settlement in Palestine, is not only nationalist and petty-bourgeois but counter-revolutionary in its effect. . . ."[76]

On Mayday 1895, Martov (real name Y. O. Tsederbaum), a future Menshevik leader, without professing to be either a Zionist or a Palestinophile propounded the following ideas in his address: "In the first years of our movement we expected everything from the movement of the Russian working class and regarded ourselves merely as an appendage to the general Russian movement. . . . Having placed the mass movement at the centre of our programme, we should have adjusted our propaganda and class agitation accordingly, i.e., we should have made them more Jewish. . . ." Continuing, Martov emphasised that "the Jewish working class is a sufficiently tight-knit mass which, when organised, will come to represent a formidable force. . . . We must bear in mind that in its class development the Russian working class will encounter such obstacles that each step forward will require tremendous effort. This being the case, it is clear that when the Russian proletariat will have to sacrifice some of its demands in order to attain a particular objective, it will prefer to sacrifice those demands which pertain exclusively to the Jews. . . ." On the basis of his own inventions, Martov arrives at the following conclusion: "That is why we must resolutely admit that our objective, the objective pursued by the Social-Democrats operating in a Jewish environment, is to create a special Jewish workers' organisation. . . ."[77]

The leadership of the Bund, which was founded in 1897, zealously disputed Martov's priority in promoting separatist ideas, ideas of isolating the Jewish working people, by referring to earlier examples.

As regards the Zionists, they were in general unable to countenance any rivalry with calm and had their views voiced by one of their prominent leaders Vladimir Jabotinsky: "The preparatory class in a model header of Zionism, to continue our pedagogical parallel, is the ojective historical role of the Bund in the Jewish working-class movement. The Bund and Zionism are not two sprouts from the same root; they are a big trunk and one of its shoots. . . . When a future scholar writes a coherent history of the Zionist movement, there will be a chapter in his work which will perhaps attract the particular attention of the readers. . . . It will begin with a repetition of Pinsker's thoughts and end

with the first proclamation of Poalei Zion. This chapter will describe an episode in Zionism and it will be headed 'The Bund'."[78]

Pointing to the danger of the attempts being made with increasing frequency to isolate the Jewish working people, Lenin addressed the following words to Jewish workers in 1905: "The conditions under which the class-conscious proletariat of the whole world lives tend to create the closest bonds and increasing unity in the systematic Social-Democratic struggle of the workers of the various nationalities. . . .

"In Russia, the workers of all nationalities, especially those of non-Russian nationality, endure an economic and political oppression such as obtains in no other country. . . . The heavier this yoke, the greater the need for the closest possible unity among the proletarians of the different nationalities; for without such unity a victorious struggle against the general oppression is impossible."[79]

Lenin's idea that the Jews suffered and struggled equally with other oppressed national groups, nationalities and nations was not calculated to suit the Zionists who used the "principle" of exclusiveness as the foundation for their ideological-theoretical structures, beginning with the divine origin of the "world Jewish nation" and ending with assertions about the need to build "our own" socialism.

Thus, by the beginning of the 20th century, the Zionists already had all the colours lined up on their ideological palette. Hiding their favourite gamut of dark hues under their cloaks in anticipation of the great revolutionary developments, the Zionists franticly daubed the façade of the Jewish Colonial Trust with red paint. But they were short of both paint and spirit, and anyway time moved too swiftly for them. It was already 1917.

Chapter III

ROOFLESS LABYRINTH

On May 2, 1918, Zeire Zion, a ramified Zionist organisation, met in secret conference in Moscow. The conference was attended by representatives from Petrograd, Moscow, Vitebsk, Voronezh, Vologda, Rybinsk, Saratov, Astrakhan, Irkutsk, Orel, Kazan, Tula, Kozlov, Kaluga, Dubrovka, Tambov, Borisoglebsk, Livny, Kineshma, Yelets, Samara, and Ryazan.

A report was delivered whose theses had been carefully discussed and approved in advance: "The basic issue of Russia's policy is that of the Russian revolution; the experiments of the socialist revolution are Bolshevik experiments in the sphere of industry, finance, state economy, foreign policy.... The results of these experiments are the collapse of the state, economic decline... and strong reaction in the West; the position of the Jewish people is economic deterioration and impoverishment of middlemen, traders, employees and artisans as a result of requisitions in the occupied regions of Russia with the same thing happening in socialist Russia as a result of Bolshevik experiments which are killing trade, industry.... Our political demands remain unchanged: the formation of a coalition government without the Bolsheviks...."[1]

A heated debate ensued. Dr. Ryss made the following point in his statement: "The Bolsheviks said that as soon as they established the dictatorship of the proletariat they would be able to achieve everything.... What will be our stand on this issue? We should have a Jewish orientation: a Russian Federative Republic must be set up in the interests of the Jewry.... What are we to do? Should we serve the Bolsheviks? Yes, we should, for it would not be a political recognition of their rule, but a question of bread."[2]

Another speaker, one Lezlin, said: "So far Bolshevism is strong, therefore it is necessary to determine ways and means of fighting it. In our daily activities we constantly come up against Bolshevik institutions. The Russian intellectuals have already renounced sabotage. We too should to a certain extent renounce sabotage. And we should work in whatever Bolshevik government departments we can."[3]

Silberg, a delegate from Astrakhan, said: "The purpose of our struggle is to organise all democratic elements in order to take power into our hands with the fall of Bolshevism.... The community is the first step in the organisation of Jewry."[4]

Thus, when the Zionists meet behind closed doors they lose all interest in discussing questions connected with the "holiness" of Zion, biblical testaments on "loving thy neighbour". Hatred for internationalism, Soviet rule and Lenin's Party was the pivot of all their sentiments in the period of the October Revolution, while the elaboration and implementation of concrete methods of struggle against communism stood at the centre of their practical activity. It could not have been otherwise with people in whose "credo" socialism was characterised as follows: "Never in the course of its long history had Jewry such an enemy... for Jewry, for the Jewish national idea socialism is a mortal foe....

"Socialism is all the more dangerous because its bitter pill is lavishly sugared, because it comes to the unfortunate Jewish people... in the guise of a 'friend' and 'deliverer'. It tells them: 'Come you, the underprivileged, and I shall deliver you.' But socialism is not such a 'platonic altruist': it demands compensation for its labours."

"What does it require of the Jews?" ask the authors of the document. "A great deal. First, it demands flesh and blood sacrifices. Socialism is preparing to overthrow the existing system by force, and such upheavals are inconceivable without bloodshed.... Socialism has inscribed on its banner the words 'The history of mankind is the history of class struggle', i.e., it views crude materialism, the call of the belly as the sole factor of history, an almost exclusive code of life.... Whatever form, international or national, socialism might crystallise into, it is equally fatal....

"Yet, if Jewry is to be capable of further historical existence it will have to develop in itself an antidote to the venom of socialism.

"And that is exactly what has happened. Raised . . . among the Jews of the world . . . the movement known as Zionism is that antidote.

"*Zionism* is creation, revival; socialism is destruction, *corruption.*

"*Zionism* is *peace*; socialism is enmity. . . .

"*Zionism* is the *unification* of the whole of Jewry; *socialism* is the struggle of one class against another.

"*Zionism* needs a modern system [i.e., capitalism—*Y. I.*]; socialism raises its *sword* against this system. . . .

"*Socialism* blocks the path to *Zionism.* Hence, Zionism and socialism are not merely two *mutually repellent* poles, but two elements, one *completely ruling out* the other. Zionism is needed wherever there are Jews, and it is essential where there is ferment in the minds of the Jews."[5]

The Zionists were quite happy to maintain contacts with the Russian tsar Nicholas II, through his ministers Pleve and Stolypin. Herzl successfully negotiated with Pleve, as did his successor Volfson with Stolypin. The demands advanced by the Zionists suited the counter-revolutionary governments both of Prince Lvov and the Socialist-Revolutionary Kerensky perfectly. According to Sokolow, the Seventh Conference of Russia's Zionists held in Petrograd in 1917, unanimously (522 votes) supported Kerensky "against his enemies" and expressed solidarity with the cause of "colonising Palestine". The only thing that did not suit the Zionists in Russia was Soviet rule, the new social and state system established under the guidance of Lenin and the Bolsheviks which did away with the exploitation of man by man. This system did not suit the Zionists any more than it suited their imperialist patrons.

". . .Once the lifeline of the British Empire was threatened by a Revolutionary Communist State to the north," Richard Crossman wrote in *A Nation Reborn,* "British Governments were bound to re-assess the value to them of the Jewish National Home."[6]

On November 17, 1917, Kiev Zionists received an urgent dispatch from Petrograd which read: "We have much pleasure in conveying to you the text of the declaration released by the British Government on November 10 which we have received today from representatives of the Zionist organisation in London. Here is the text, word for word. 'His Majesty's Government view with favour the establish-

ment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. . . .' The noble act of the British Government opens a new era; Herzl's behest is being realised. Bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Jews of your region, organise meetings, adopt resolutions. Cable. Merkaz."[7]

That was how the Petrograd Merkaz* informed the Kiev Zionists about the Balfour Declaration issued by the British Government in November 1917, that is, simultaneously with the opening of intensive talks between the British and other imperialist governments concerning military intervention against the young Soviet Republic.

Shortly after the Kiev Zionists had received instructions from the centre in London on measures to be taken in connection with this clear statement of Britain's firm intention of gaining possession of all regions adjoining the Suez Canal by any means possible, a notorious adventurist Vladimir Jabotinsky made his appearance in the Ukraine. A poet from Russia, Zionist and agent of a number of powers, large and small, Jabotinsky had only recently won the absolute trust of the British by organising together with a certain Trumpeldorf a Zionist Legion which had moved in with the British troops to occupy Palestine.

According to Kornei Chukovsky, who edited Colonel Patterson's book and wrote the preface to it, the British professional colonialists were very pleased with the efforts of their henchmen. "We, naturally, were interested only in those chapters," Chukovsky wrote, "which dealt with volunteer Zionist detachments that had joined the British Army to win back Palestine. Patterson is not a Jew, but a pure Anglo-Saxon. He is an experienced military man and an authority on all kinds of combat. . . . He learned his trade all over the place. In India, in South Africa . . . in Uganda, in the Klondike. . . . Therefore his praise for the fighting qualities of the Zionists carries special weight."[8]

Vladimir Jabotinsky, one of the inspirers of some of the most decisive moves in support of the British occupation of Palestine, was hastily sent to the Ukraine to establish contact and co-operate with—the leader of the Ukrainian counter-revolution, Petlura.

Let us make a short digression. The attention of a person making his way along the winding corridors of the Zionist

---

* Centre.

labyrinth at the height of the stormy developments following the world's first socialist revolution, is involuntarily attracted by a somewhat faded Zionist "business" document written in a clear hand.

On April 5, 1914 the Board of Jewish Colonies in Cologne sent a business message to a clerk of Sharkansky Bros. Abram Itskov Domovich, head of the Herzlite Zionist circle in Lomza. "Upon re-checking your account of donation money-boxes we find that you have only sent us donations from 97 out of 108....

"... We collect 5,000,000 francs annually, a sum large enough to buy 10 colonies each year.... We said long ago, in 1911 and 1912, that Russian Jews had been zealous and that we were grateful to them. But despite their efforts they could have made a still greater contribution to the cause lately, since, according to our information, we know that about a thousand towns in Russia have not started paying.

"Although many towns, for example, Vilnius, Zhitomir, Kovno and Riga, are paying, their contribution is very small.

"We derive our biggest income from Russia... but compared with the size of the Jewish population of Russia and that in other countries, she gives us very little and if we took all countries according to the number of Jews in them and the income we get from them, Russia would come 19th on the list.

"Our total income from Russia amounts to two kopeks from each Jew, i.e., if all the money collected in Russia is divided by the number of Jews living there, the figure will be two kopeks from each."[9]

Here is another document, a general list of revenues received by the World Zionist Organisation for 1913 in German marks:[10]

"Russia	237,284.83
"Austria	144,133.27
"North America	143,740.50
"Germany	107,905.17
"Canada	37,563.50
"South Africa	20,766.97
"England	18,862.14" and so forth.

The international Zionist corporation clearly understated its income, but even the above figures clearly show that the

nationalisation of the means of production on a sixth part of the world which had formerly paid a large tribute, and the triumph of Lenin's principles in the nationalities policy of the young Soviet Republic had dealt a severe blow to the Jewish Colonial Trust in London and the Zionist leaders who always relied on anti-Semitism in all their plans. Yes, the October Revolution had a devastating impact on the international Zionist concern and, accordingly, Zionism henceforth concentrated its efforts on attempting to overthrow the Soviet state.

Zionists participated in the "governments" of Denikin, Hetman Skoropadsky and Petlura,* and were busy forming Zionist military units which fought against Soviet Russia. Incidentally, from 1918 to 1921 the counter-revolutionary bands of Denikin, Petlura, Bulak-Bulakhovich and Makhno organised 1,520 pogroms, during which tens of thousands of Jews were tortured or killed. This, however, was no obstacle to a firm ideological, economic and military alliance between the counter-revolution and the leaders of the international Zionist centre.

The Zionists were equally zealous in conducting subversive activities within the Soviet Republic. Besides engaging in sabotage and spying activities, they devoted serious efforts to "legal" forms of opposition, organising, under a variety of pretexts, numerous societies and unions which became centres of anti-Soviet activities.

A case in point is the Leningrad Jewish Aid Committee (LJAC) whose predecessors were the Jewish Benevolent Society, registered with the Petrograd Gubernia Executive Committee in 1919, and the Jewish Mutual Aid Society.

The Charter of the Jewish Benevolent Society read: "The Society has been set up to assist the indigent population of Petrograd for which purpose it will issue interest-free loans and grants, maintain and organise Jewish kosher canteens . . ."[11] and so forth.

So much for words. Let us take a look at its actual activities. Here is an excerpt from the record of a meeting of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection of the Central City District held on January 10, 1930, to discuss the liquidation

---

* Counter-revolutionary "governments" formed in areas under temporary whiteguard occupation during the Civil War and foreign intervention in Russia.

of the LJAC. "The artels organised by the LJAC accepted merchants in arrears to the Regional Revenue Office and not only Jews but also those of other nationalities. While undertaking to assist needy Jews the LJAC did its utmost to help the traders by shielding them under the name of its firm from the Regional Revenue Office. The artels were headed by people wholly unacquainted with production . . . Aizberg, Lesman. The LJAC acted as a link with religious organisations. It fans nationalistic sentiments, engages in commerce (the auction hall) and has class-aliens in its leadership."[12]

In 1927, I. S. Schneerson left the Soviet Union for bourgeois Latvia to assume the office of the Chief Rabbi of Riga. Shortly afterwards, while in Germany, he met two representatives of US Big Business, and not without personal profit became a central figure in transferring very considerable sums of money from the US subversive Zionist organisation, Joint, to its agents in the USSR. The LJAC was, in effect, one of the screens masking the activity of Joint agents in the Soviet Union.

Years passed. The Soviet Union withstood the onslaught of external and domestic counter-revolution. The Soviet state gained strength. And the more evident it became that the plans of imperialism and its henchmen for destroying the world's first working people's state were quite futile, the more furious became the hatred of international reaction for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In this, the Zionists kept their own account in a special column marked "Communism".

"World Jewry [read "the Zionist leaders"—*Y.I.*]," wrote Richard Crossman, MP, "failed equally to fulfil its share of the task, the provision of half a million immigrants in the first few years [after the establishment of the Zionist corporation—*Y.I.*]. The main cause of this failure was, of course, the Bolshevik Revolution. Zionists had always assumed that Russia would provide the main source of mass immigration into Palestine."[13]

It will become absolutely clear why Zionists hate the Soviet Union if to the direct obligations of the Zionists (to the British imperialists) we were to add a still more determining factor mentioned above, namely, the enactment of Soviet laws which stopped the flow of money from Russia into the safes of the Zionist corporation.

Jewish working people actively supported the October

Socialist Revolution and joined in the building of socialism in the USSR. This predetermined the crisis of Zionism which was further aggravated following the liquidation of the Zionist underground in the Soviet Union and the refusal of many Jews to co-operate with the Zionists.

In these circumstances Zionist leaders resorted to new tactics and began to look for other ways of salvaging their enterprise. The bugbear of "eternal anti-Semitism" was temporarily relegated to the background to give way to new, more flexible slogans. "We have never built our Zionist Movement on the sufferings of our people in Russia or elsewhere,"[14] wrote Nahum Sokolow in those years.

The depleted forces of "socialist" Zionists closed ranks and took to elaborating "new" theories. Berl Locker, a representative of this chosen detachment of the Zionist guard, formulated the thesis: "In Socialist society especially, our nation would be unable to bear its homelessness, and we should earnestly strive with all our strength to build up our national centre in Palestine."[15]

Backed by representatives of major imperialist financial associations, the Zionist concern set up a number of organisations especially for the purpose of conducting massive anti-Soviet propaganda to discredit the idea of socialism, and also to build up inside the socialist state a section of "liberal intelligentsia" whose freedom of "thought" would be nothing more than readiness to accept thoughts furnished from abroad and to present them as their own.

In 1921 the Jewish Telegraphic Agency was simultaneously established in Britain and the USA. Its organisers were Jacob Landau, a Zionist capitalist, and the journalist Meir Grossman. The views of the former were determined by his wealth, those of the latter by his love for wealth.

Grossman edited Zionist newspapers and magazines between 1913 and 1916 in Berlin and Copenhagen, in 1917 in Kiev and from 1919 to 1931 in London. In 1933 he came to the conclusion that the super-reactionary extreme faction in the World Zionist Organisation led by the social-chauvinist Jabotinsky did not fit the bill and created another one, the Jewish State Party, to uproot communism in—Zionism.

The functions of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency more than conformed to the biographical characteristics of its founders.

The representative of the Agency and its Zionist leaders

in Austria was Grossman's adherent Robert Stricker, a close friend of Nahum Goldmann, former official for Jewish affairs of Kaiser Germany's Foreign Ministry. (Together with Goldmann and a white emigre named Soloveichik, in his time Stricker formed a group of "radical Zionists" which had its centre in Berlin.) Stricker and Goldmann often got together, talked, lamented the decline of the prestige and influence of German Zionists in the international Zionist corporation (after Germany's defeat in the First World War) and discussed how they could re-establish their influence. In these conversations they frequently mentioned one Stephen Wise who created a great-Zionist faction in 1929 and gained notoriety by his malicious anti-communist utterances.

Rabbi Wise rapidly rose up in the world and at the time when Stricker and Goldmann had their chats in Vienna, he was already president of the American Jewish Congress, a rather influential "non-Zionist" organisation for those days. The Congress was backed by some of the biggest US financiers, who, as it transpired, "yearned" for Palestine no less than their British counterparts.

In view of the disappointment of part of the British ruling circles with the Zionist corporation for its failure to "do its bit", intrigues among the leadership of the Zionist concern, the sharp decline in the flow of funds into the Zionist treasury, and above all, the refusal of a considerable number of Jewish workers to co-operate with Zionism, Zionist circles conceived the idea of establishing a "world organisation" ostensibly having nothing in common with Zionism and functioning solely under the slogan of "defence of the rights of world Jewry". Its actual aim, however, was to act as a bridge for US capital, which was stepping up its efforts to replace Britannia, or the "Ruler of the Waves", in the Middle East, and to set up close ties with fascism which was rapidly developing in Europe. In short, it was trying to play safe by backing three of the fastest horses running in the capitalist derby. For the early 1930s this was a new idea, although the principle underlying it was old—twenty years earlier Zionism had shamelessly flirted simultaneously with Lord Balfour, Wilhelm II, Pleve, the Turkish Sultan and the King of Italy.

This was the background against which Nahum Goldmann's star came into the ascendant. His success was due to his extensive connections and unbridled but cautious career-

ism bred in the gloomy offices of the Foreign Ministry of the Second Reich.

Goldmann's first step was to come to an agreement with the President of the American Jewish Congress Stephen Wise on the question of establishing a "non-Zionist" World Jewish Congress. Having made sure American financiers, the real bosses of the Congress, were well-disposed, Wise approached the proposal with understanding. Then after negotiating a controlling block of shares in the enterprise, and promising to cover 50 per cent of the new organisation's budget in exchange, he agreed.

Chaim Weizmann, the then President of the World Zionist Organisation, who had firmly linked up his future with Britain, persuaded his patron that Goldmann's venture had been planned with his knowledge, and would be extremely profitable for Great Britain.

The third step was to obtain the support of the fascists.

Zionist intelligence having made a few deep probes and found that the omens were favourable, in November 1934 Goldmann hastily left for Rome. A great deal depended on the outcome of his meeting with Mussolini. The fascist dictator's reaction to the Zionist project was a matter of great concern not only to Goldmann, but to all Zionist leaders, and they followed the mission of the former German diplomat with close attention.

Mussolini received Goldmann on November 13, 1934, and their thirty-minute talk passed in an atmosphere of good will and mutual understanding. Mussolini approved of the idea of founding a World Jewish Congress and promised his support. The Goldmann mission was a success and signified a great deal for him personally. On November 14, 1934, his name appeared for the first time in the biggest European newspapers next to the name of "one of the most powerful personalities of the Western World".

The question of the formation of the World Jewish Congress (with Goldmann as one of its leaders) as the ante-room to the World Zionist Organisation, could thus be regarded as settled.

Until as recently as 1968 Goldmann was president of both the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organisation.

Thus having created another international association into whose activities it would be possible to draw people who

had initially refused to have anything to do with Zionist concepts or aims, and secured additional support from US capital, Italian fascism, and later nazism, Zionist leaders, in pursuance of their own aims, continued to serve the British crown maintaining their alliance with it because of Britain's leading role in the rapacious world of capitalism.

On receiving the mandate of the League of Nations, in 1922-23 Great Britain established her control over Palestine. Since the Arab population of the country vigorously opposed British colonial oppression, Britain began to depend more than ever on the Zionists in the matter of "fitting up" Palestine with a population prepared to guard British interests, and generally encouraged Zionist colonisation. Let us recall what the British papers wrote in anticipation of these developments. When the whole of Palestine is "to be brought securely under our control", wrote *The Manchester Guardian*, "then on the conclusion of peace our deliberate policy will be to encourage in every way in our power Jewish immigration...". *The Irish Times* stated: "From the British point of view the defence of the Suez Canal can best be secured by the establishment in Palestine of a people attached to us...."[16]

After more than twenty years of intense efforts (from 1897 to 1919) British ruling circles and the Zionists managed to increase the Jewish population of Palestine from 5 to 10 per cent of the total.[17] It was a torturous process not only because Jews refused to be coaxed into taking up residence in the area of the Suez Canal, but also because the Arabs, who accounted for 90 per cent of the population of Palestine, justifiably viewed both the British and the Jewish settlers sent by the Zionists as colonialists out to rob them.

Ahad Ha'am who visited Palestine about this time made a few interesting admissions. "We think," he wrote, "that the Arabs are all savages who live like animals and do not understand what is happening around them. This is, however, a grave error.... Yet what do our brethren do in Palestine?... They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them, offend them without cause and boast of these deeds; and nobody among us opposes this despicable and dangerous inclination."[18] (This was said by a prominent Zionist ideologue, although by then retired since his services were no longer needed.)

Ahad Ha'am had sufficient foresight to visualise the ultimate results of the Zionist leaders' persistent efforts to foster contempt and hatred for the native population of Palestine among the Jewish settlers. But the British Lords were least concerned with them. Lord Balfour, with native cold-blooded cynicism, declared in public that the principle of self-determination justified (!) Zionism however inapplicable it might be from a purely technical point of view.[19]

Those familiar with the history of British colonial expansion and rule are perfectly aware of the "technical" methods and motives of British ruling circles.

In its 1937 report, the Palestine Royal Commission wrote: "In 1920, 1921 and 1929 the Arabs attacked the Jews. In 1933 [not to mention the 1936-1938 uprising—*Y.I.*] they attacked the Government.... The Mandate was merely a cynical device for promoting British 'imperialism" under a mask of humane considerations for the Jews."[20]

The crux of the matter was unwittingly explained by Lord Alfred Mond Melchett, who wrote that the Arab people rose against any civilised immigration, of any sort, against people of any race or religious belief.* The Moors in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia always rose against newcomers; Italy encountered similar difficulties in Tripoli, too.[21]

Taking up this issue, Chaim Weizmann reiterated that "the choice in Palestine was not between right and wrong but between a greater and lesser injustice".[22] Indeed, a brilliant example of Zionist "dialectics"! This thought is even more clearly expressed by an English publicist, Herbert Sidebotham.

"It is a false view of democratic or liberal principle," he writes, "which holds that because a race or a nation happens to occupy a certain territory that territory is its own for all time.... Occupation must be beneficial and in the long run beneficial for the world at large, or it loses its moral or political justification. Nor has any race an absolute right to 'determine' its own future at the expense of the future of some other race which may have more to give the world."[23]

Thus, the Zionists' ideological baggage was supplemented by yet a further concept which had much in common with the theories elaborated by the ideologues of the Third Reich.

---

* A prominent Zionist's frank admission that the Arabs' fight against colonisation was not specifically anti-Semitic.

A year before Hitler came to power in Germany and two years before Goldmann's talks with Mussolini, the Jews made up just over 19 per cent[24] of the total population of Palestine. This was the limit which the Zionists and their British patrons managed to attain at the cost of tremendous efforts over a period of 35 years.

In fact this figure was not attained solely through the efforts of the Zionists. In 1917, half the Jews living in Palestine (who then accounted for 10 per cent of the population) were native Palestinians and, consequently, their presence there could not be credited to Herzl & Co. Later, some of the Jews who had fled from the counter-revolution in Eastern Europe settled down in Palestine, as they did in other countries, in search of a haven and not with the Zionist objective of winning back Canaan. In these 35 years, therefore, a very insignificant number of people came to Palestine on a Zionist "ticket" or with Zionist intentions. In this connection the fact that in 1919 a Communist Party was founded in Palestine, which to this day is waging a successful struggle from internationalist positions, was highly indicative.

Even those who "professed" Zionism were well aware of its far from lofty goals. "We know what you expect from us," declared Max Nordau in a speech in the Albert Hall in 1919 in which he went over in detail the mutual commitments of the Zionists and British ruling circles. "We shall have to be the guards of the Suez Canal. We shall have to be the sentinels of your way to India via the Near East. We are ready to fulfil this difficult military service, but it is essential to allow us to become a *power* in order to enable us to do our task."[25]

And the British worked consistently towards their goal of establishing this "power" in Palestine. Although they made up an insignificant part of the Jewish population in Palestine, the Zionists, as representatives of a major international corporation, assumed a dominating position in the economy. In the political and military spheres they benefited from the generous assistance of the holders of the League of Nations' mandate.

All democratic elements among the Jewish population, not to mention the Arab majority, were under constant surveillance and systematically subjected to persecutions. A ramified system of Zionist educational and propaganda institu-

tions slowly but surely corroded the Jewish colony in Palestine.

The British actively helped the Jewish settlers to form well-armed "self-defence" units which could be used against the national liberation movement of the Arabs. According to Vladimir Jabotinsky, Jews with a bent for colonisation were called upon to rule the country. As regards measures for guaranteeing security, Jabotinsky made the following statement to the Palestine Royal Commission: "A nation with your colossal colonising past experience surely knows that colonisation never went without certain conflicts with the population on the spot.... Legalise our self-defence, as you are doing in Kenya."[26]

Captain Orde Wingate, a professional secret agent, was attached to the command of the Jewish self-defence units for the purpose of turning them into professional military punitive detachments. One of their tasks was the forcible eviction of the Arabs from their ancient lands. Israel Bir, Ben-Gurion's former adviser, wrote the following about the functions of Zionist punitive detachments after being trained by Wingate (Bir was describing the suppression of the 1936-1938 Arab uprising): The special night units did more than any other forces to suppress the (Arab—*Y.I.*) disturbances, which were directed more against the British than the Jews, as the Palestine Royal Commission admitted. Wingate's special detachments were formed not only with the object of putting an end to the guerilla warfare (using the same tactics), but more especially for the purpose of protecting a valuable imperial objective—the Iraq oil pipeline (which ended at Haifa—*Y.I.*).[27]

One of the top commanders of the Haganah, as these detachments were called, was Feivel Polkes who was also the chief resident agent of the nazi Intelligence Service in Palestine and Syria. The following appeared on the pages of the West German *Der Spiegel* on December 19, 1966: "Agent Reichert of the German Information Bureau in Palestine was in contact with a leading functionary of a secret Zionist organisation which more than anything else (with the exception of the British Intelligence Service) captured the imagination of German Intelligence. This organisation was called Haganah. In the general headquarters of this secret army worked... Feivel Polkes.... He was in charge, according to von Mildenstein's successor as Chief of the

Division for Jewish Affairs II.112 of the intelligence headquarters, Hagen, of the *administration of the entire security apparatus of the Palestinian Jews*"[28] (emphasis added—*Y.I.*).

While Feivel Polkes with his cutthroats ministered to nazi Germany's external "needs", Dr. Nossig, the same Dr. Nossig who in the reign of Wilhelm II upheld the project of settling the Jews in the Ottoman Empire outside of Palestine, was equally zealous in ministering to the "domestic needs" of the nazis. Zionist leader, writer, sculptor and politician in whose Berlin office such prominent Zionists as Arthur Ruppin and Jacob Thon had worked in their time,[29] Nossig together with the nazis designed the plan for destroying aged and needy German Jews. Nossig lived to the age of eighty, when, according to Moshe Sneh, he was executed by the fighters of the Warsaw ghetto who had found out about his crimes. Such was the degree of this prominent Zionist leader's loyalty to German imperialism, Sneh added.[30]

Goldmann, Polkes, Nossig, these direct links with fascism, were by no means exceptions. "Zionists," wrote Heinz Höhne, a German journalist, "viewed the consolidation of the nazis in Germany not as a national calamity, but as a unique historical opportunity for achieving their Zionist objectives." He asserted that "since the Zionists and the National Socialists had elevated race and nation to the scale of all things, it was inevitable that a common bridge should have appeared between them".[31]

US columnist Morris Cohen seconded this view, stressing that "Zionists fundamentally accept the racial ideology of these anti-Semites, but draw different conclusions. Instead of the Teuton, it is the Jew that is the pure or superior race".[32]

In 1933, the 238,000 Jews living in Palestine accounted for about 20 per cent of the country's total population. By 1936 their number had risen to 404,000, i.e., by more than 50 per cent.[33] And it would be naive to think that this considerable influx of newcomers was due to the "triumph" of Zionist ideas. It was fascist atrocities which forced Jews to seek a haven, and Palestine was merely one of the numerous regions where they found it. Forced to admit this fact, the Zionist Edelman wrote that the Jews went to Palestine not with the express intention of setting up a Jewish national home there, but simply to save their lives.[34]

At that period the so-called Palestine Office supported by the nazis was busy "selecting" refugees with the direct participation of the former Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol. In their book *The Secret Roads*, David and Jon Kimche wrote: "Jewish emissaries had not come to Nazi Germany to save German Jews.... They were looking for young men and women who wanted to go to Palestine and were prepared to pioneer, struggle and ... fight for it."[35]

Quoting documentary evidence Heinz Höhne wrote: "...von Mildenstein, Chief of the Division for Jewish Affairs II.112 of the intelligence headquarters did all he could to assist Zionist organisations in the establishment of re-education camps where young Jews were trained for work in kibbutzes in Palestine. He carefully followed the activity of the Zionists, and ordered his Division to draft maps showing the progress of Zionism among German Jewry."[36]

These re-education camps were set up in nazi Germany following an agreement between Zionist emissaries and Adolf Eichmann. Disclosing Eichmann's attitude to the Zionists, Israeli journalist Hannah Arendt wrote that the latter "unlike the Assimilationists, whom he always despised, and unlike Orthodox Jews, who bored him, were 'idealists' like him".[37]

Zionists, as we know, have always favoured anti-Semitism in which they openly placed all their hopes for the future. Therefore the conclusion of a secret alliance between Zionism and fascism was not at all unnatural. Intent on achieving their goals, the Zionists reacted in a most peculiar fashion to the anti-Semitic orgies of the nazis. The British Zionist Lord Melchett wrote in a book published in 1937 that the persecution of the Jews in Germany was an obstacle to closer relations between the German and other European nations. To improve the situation Melchett recommended a mass and complete evacuation of German Jews to Palestine. His book can in no way be qualified as an indictment of nazi outrages.[38]

Chaim Weizmann viewed the developments in Germany with still greater equanimity and tolerance. In reply to a query of the Palestine Royal Commission about the possibility of transferring 6,000,000 West European Jews to Palestine, he said: "No, the old will go.... They are dust, economic and moral dust of the world.... Only the branch will remain."

Twenty-one years after the rout of nazi Germany, Zionist

leaders let slip the causes of their loyal neutrality. "If we [Zionists—*Y.I.*] had regarded the saving of the maximum number of Jews as our *basic task* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*]," declared Eliezer Livneh, a prominent Zionist, "then we would have had to co-operate with the partisans. There were partisan bases in Poland, Lithuania, in the nazi-occupied parts of Russia, in Yugoslavia and later in Slovakia. If our *main task* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*] was to prevent the liquidation (of the Jews) and if we had entered into contact with the partisan bases, we could have saved many lives."[39]

Zionist leader Chaim Landau made public the views entertained on this issue by Yizchak Gruenbaum, who in the period of the fascist atrocities headed the Zionist Salvation Committee. "When I was asked," wrote Landau quoting Gruenbaum, "whether I would give money from the Karen Haechod [Zionist fund—*Y.I.*] to save the Jews of the Diaspora, I said 'no'. And now, too, I shall say 'no'. I consider that we have to withstand this wave, otherwise it will engulf us and push our Zionist activity into the background."[40]

The Zionists' policy towards the fascists was one of tacit consent (on the basis of the deal between the Zionist emissaries and Eichmann) and helped create the conditions which enabled the persecution of the Jews in Germany to attain the maximum possible proportions; this policy also consisted in the *post-factum* organisation of noisy protests to gain political and other capital.

Pointing to the main consequences of the "mutually highly satisfactory agreement between the Nazi authorities and the Jewish Agency for Palestine" Hannah Arendt writes: "The result was that in the thirties, when American Jewry took great pains to organise a boycott of German merchandise, Palestine, of all places, was swamped with all kinds of goods 'made in Germany'."[41]

David Flinker, an American journalist, noted on May 24, 1963, in the *Tog Morgen Journal* that "Ben-Gurion, as head of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem in the thirties, concluded what was known as a transfer-deal with the Hitler government under which the assets of the Jews who had left the country were transferred in the form of German goods and thus prevented the institution of a boycott of the nazis. . .". Moreover, writer Ben Hecht publicly accused Ben-Gurion of deliberately keeping silent in the period when the world public was already informed of the nazi atrocities.

On November 25, 1940, the ship *Patria* was blown up in the port of Haifa in Palestine. Fifty members of the crew and 202 emigrants on board perished.

These people were killed at one of the junctions of the tortuous labyrinth of developments, knowing neither their killers nor the true motives of the crime. A whole chain of events led up to this tragedy which could be called a landmark in a complex manoeuvre designed and methodically executed by the leaders of the Zionist concern. We must take look at it before returning to the explosion on the *Patria.*

Among the American bankers, Jacob H. Schiff, his son-in-law and successor Felix Warburg and the latter's son Edward Warburg were regarded as people with imagination. The foundation for this reputation was laid by Jacob Schiff, owner of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. Bank, who became the factual owner of the American Jewish Committee (AJC) founded in 1906, which proclaimed "defence of the rights of world Jewry" as the central point of its programme. Although not entirely original, since it copied the project of the British who staked on Herzl's World Zionist Organisation, Schiff's plan was nevertheless new for America. Under the guise of concern for the lot of the Jews in various countries, the AJC was an instrument used by Kuhn, Loeb and Co., the Lehmen Bros., and the Strauss family for investing their capital in different parts of the world. (It was with representatives of this group of financiers that the Riga Rabbi Schneerson established contact while in Germany.)* Following the instructions of its chiefs, the AJC at first vigorously opposed Zionism since the Zionist leaders encouraged the movement of capital from another country—Britain. In 1926, however, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and the Lehmen Bros., founded the Palestine Economic Corporation, A. Marshall and L. Strauss also providing capital, and, in the interests of their own pockets, defected to the Zionists. In just ten years, this financial group which had the backing of a number of the wealthiest Jewish capitalists, "remoulded" the majority of American Jewish organisations (including religious unions) into Zionist or pro-Zionist organisations and in slightly over 20 years increased the corpora-

---

* See p. 71 of this book.—*Ed.*

tion's share capital fivefold, bringing most branches of the Palestinian economy under its sway.

In 1929, A. Marshall, a shareholder in the Palestine Economic Corporation, brought off a successful round of talks with the pro-British leadership of the World Zionist Organisation concerning the entry of American "non-Zionists" into the Zionist Jewish Agency, a legal advisory body under the British Commissioner for Palestine.* (Some of the wealthiest US businessmen were among the "non-Zionists" that made up 50 [!] per cent of the Agency's membership.)

The World Jewish Congress (WJC), the "non-Zionist branch" of the World Zionist Organisation, was founded in 1936. Manifestly predominant in the WJC leadership were representatives and paid agents of US financiers headed by Nahum Goldmann.

The Zionist leaders viewed the formation of a "Jewish national centre" in Palestine as a highly profitable enterprise, especially for themselves. We have already described in detail the goals which they pursued. The Zionists closely collaborated with the British up to 1939, because the interests of the British ruling circles coincided with those of the Zionist leaders in the Middle East, and because at that time Britain played the leading role among the imperialist powers.

In view of the increasing penetration of US capital into Palestine, its mounting influence within the Zionist corporation and the fact that the Zionist leaders continued their simultaneous flirtation with the nazis and the Americans, the City of London felt it necessary to put pressure on the Zionist leaders and bludgeon them into undivided co-operation.

In 1939, to further this aim, Great Britain, the author of numerous projects for resettling the Jews in Palestine for the purpose of colonising the country, produced a White Paper sharply limiting the immigration of Jews into Palestine and simultaneously encouraged the feudal leaders of the native Palestinian population to incite clashes with the Jewish settlers.

Meanwhile the nazis were intensifying their persecution of the Jews. Many thousands of people in Germany were

---

* Not to be confused with the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, international Zionism's propaganda organ.

sent either to concentration camps, or to "re-education" camps and thence to Palestine. "National Jewish circles," wrote Hagen, pleading Polkes's view, "are very pleased with the radical policy of the Germans with regard to the Jews, since it tends to increase the Jewish population in Palestine so that in the near future we shall be able to count on a preponderance of Jews over the Arabs."[42]

Heinz Höhne stressed that "the Zionist group, which was backed by the 'Haganah' whose leadership included Eichmann's confidential agent Polkes, opposed Britain's new policy on the question of resettling the Jews".[43] This organisation "set up a network of confidential agents in Europe who secretly smuggled Jewish settlers to Palestine. Golomb's* people had no scruples about availing themselves of SS assistance in this work...".[44]

Unravelling the knot of secret ties between the nazis and the Zionists, Höhne wrote: "During the Jewish pogrom which had the code name 'Crystal Night', two representatives of the Mossad,** Pino Ginzburg and Moshe Auerbach, arrived in Hitler's Reich.... They suggested speeding up the Zionist programme of re-educating the Jews prepared to go to Palestine....

"...German transports of the Mossad which carried the Jews—and this was a secret condition put forward by German Intelligence—were not to disclose Palestine as their destination."[45]

Pino Ginzburg had his first contingent ready in March 1939. "He had 280 emigrants," wrote Höhne, "and Mexico was named as the destination in keeping with instructions from Reich headquarters. In Vienna these 280 people joined a group organised by Moshe Auerbach; in the Yugoslav port of Sušak they boarded the *Colorado,* transferred to the *Otranto* near Corfu... and were delivered to Palestine.... The more rigorous the British counter-measures, the more prepared Heidrich's headquarters was to help (the Zionists). In the middle of the summer it let Ginzburg direct his ships to Emden and Hamburg to transport the Jews straight from Germany...."[46]

As we know, the Zionists were acting not out of concern for people's lives, but in order to increase the number of

---

* Eliahu Golomb, a Haganah commander.

** An organisation set up by the Haganah leaders.

Jewish settlers in Palestine. This policy was fully in keeping with the interests of US monopoly capital with which the international Zionist corporation was coming into an increasingly open alliance in violation of its long-standing agreement with Britain. It was these circumstances that determined the fate of *Patria*'s passengers.

When the ship dropped anchor in Haifa, British colonial authorities, implementing the new immigration laws, refused to let the passengers disembark and said that the ship with its passengers would be taken to Mauritius. Thereupon Zionist Intelligence decided to destroy the *Patria* with all on board.

There was one obvious reason among many unknown ones behind this barbarous act: before destroying the *Patria* with its passengers, the Zionists invented the legend about an unprecedented case of mass suicide of people who "preferred death to separation from the homeland". Their death and the circulation of this rumour, the Zionists calculated, would strengthen the "spirit of Zionism" everywhere, incite world public opinion against the British and thus lead to the abrogation of the British White Paper limiting entry into Palestine, something for which certain US financial circles were now actively working.

"The origin of the explosion was never formally established," wrote Jon and David Kimche, "but it was an open secret that it had been organised by the Haganah.... But in Palestine and outside the legend that immigrants had themselves blown up their own ship was accepted...."[47]

Following the establishment of effective contacts between the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation and prominent US financiers (late 20s-early 30s), the membership of US Zionist organisations steadily increased and by 1945 numbered 400,000. Disclosing the true reasons for such a rapid growth, the US Jewish newspaper *Forward* wrote on December 11, 1943, that the Jewish Conference (in the USA—*Y.I.*) keeps awake only when Palestinian affairs are in the air, and sleeps when the question turns to saving the lives of Jews in the Diaspora.

No small part in encouraging such sentiments was evidently played by Kuhn, Loeb and Co. We might note that their "waking up" during the discussion of Palestinian affairs was not due to a desire to settle down in the

"promised land". Emigration from the USA to Palestine was always negligible.

As the US State Department admitted, "throughout the mandate period the United States [in other words, US monopolies—*Y.I.*] took an interest in Palestine.... However, we opposed the British White Paper in 1939 which limited migration".[48] In December 1942, 63 Senators and 181 Congressmen called on Roosevelt "to restore the Jewish homeland".[49] In July 1945, the majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives asked Truman to "use all his influence to open Palestine and thus ensure unimpeded Jewish immigration and *colonisation*...".

(Documents from the most diverse periods show that all the interested powers, beginning with Napoleon Bonaparte and ending with the ruling circles of the imperialist USA which came to the forefront after the Second World War, directly spoke about the *colonisation* of the land known as Palestine.)

A. Lilienthal notes that from December 1942 onwards US presidents were subjected to massive pressure from Senators and Congressmen demanding that Britain should be forced to lift her restrictions on immigration to Palestine. Incidentally, by then the share capital of the Palestine Economic Corporation alone had increased more than fourfold and required effective guarantees and protection.

Yet, Henry Morgenthau, Finance Secretary in the Roosevelt Administration, notes: "*From August 1942 on* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*], we in Washington knew that the nazis were planning the complete extermination of the Jews in Europe. For one and a half years after the barbarous plan had become known, the State Department did practically nothing at all."[50]

Thus, Senators and Congressmen demanded the lifting of Britain's restrictions on immigration into Palestine, and freedom to transport refugees to the Middle East, not to the United States whither hundreds of ships sailed empty after unloading cargoes in Europe. Thus, in effect, they closed the one road to safety for many thousands of Jews.

Behind all this we can clearly discern the hand of the Palestine Economic Corporation and the Zionist centre.

In the last years of the Second World War, the public in all countries was widely informed about the nazi atrocities.

But the Zionists, accessories to numerous brutal crimes, remained in the shadows. Availing themselves of the opportunities and means provided by their allies, they evaded retribution leaving a maze of twisted paths behind them.

At that time the so-called Salvation Committee appointed by the Zionist Jewish Agency was functioning in Hungary. It was headed by one Rudolf Kastner who had maintained very close ties with Eichmann. "The greatest 'idealist' Eichmann ever encountered among the Jews," wrote Hannah Arendt, "was Dr. Rudolf Kastner . . . with whom he came to an agreement that he, Eichmann, would permit the 'illegal' departure of a few thousand Jews to Palestine (the trains were in fact guarded by German police) in exchange for 'quiet and order' in the camps [in Hungary—*Y.I.*] from which hundreds of thousands were shipped to Auschwitz." Hannah Arendt pointed out that prominent Jews and members of the Zionist youth organisations who were saved by the agreement "were, in Eichmann's words, 'the best biological material'; Dr. Kastner, as Eichmann understood it, had sacrificed his fellow-Jews to his 'idea'. . .".[51]

Arriving safely in Palestine, Dr. Kastner changed his name from Rudolf to Israel and became a prominent functionary of the Zionist Mapai Party headed by Ben-Gurion, Golda Meir and others. Later he was secretly liquidated by the Israeli political police[52] for admitting that the Hungarian Zionist centre had had a hand in the liquidation of hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews.

. . .It was 1944. The German army was retreating under the blows of the Soviet troops. Its losses in men and materiel were telling heavily on Germany. To transfer its troops and concentrate them as swiftly as possible on the most vulnerable sectors of the Eastern Front the nazi command needed transport facilities—thousands of lorries.

At the beginning of May 1944, Eichmann was ordered to obtain 10,000 lorries through the Zionists for dispatch to the Eastern Front in exchange for a promise to liberate the Jews from German camps for shipment to Palestine. (By then the Jews comprised about 30 per cent of the total population of Palestine.)

Eichmann met with Joël Brandt, a Hungarian Zionist leader, who promptly communicated the nazi proposal to the Zionist Committee. The latter sent Brandt to Constan-

tinople to discuss the matter with representatives of the Jewish Agency.[53]

The Zionist leaders, headed by Chaim Weizmann, unhesitatingly agreed to supply the nazi command of the Eastern Front with 10,000 lorries.[54] The Zionists had always regarded the Soviet Union and its armed forces as their direct enemy, and the decision was therefore a perfectly natural one for them to take.

Zionist politicians and dealers, who to this day claim to be the "defenders and benefactors" of Jews in all countries, suffered absolutely no remorse about the fact that besides Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians and men of all the other nationalities of the Soviet Union, there were Jewish soldiers, sailors, officers and generals fighting with the troops whose advance the nazis wanted to stop at any price. For all of them, whether members of the Communist Party or not, there was only one homeland—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—and they defended it with honour. That they might die in circumstances which the Zionists were ready and willing to create did not worry the latter in the slightest. Morris Ernst, a US journalist, was perfectly right when he wrote that the Zionists "are little concerned about human blood if it is not their own".[55]

Chaim Weizmann, then leader of international Zionism, and his consorts Nahum Goldmann, Ben-Gurion, Levi Eshkol, Golda Meir and many other present-day Zionist leaders pressed Churchill for assistance in the matter of delivering the lorries. It was only fear of publicity and the anger of world public opinion that forced that organiser of numerous diversions against the USSR to refuse "reluctantly, and with heavy heart. . .".[56]

In the last years of the war, under the influence of US capital which was playing an increasingly dominant role in the capitalist world, the international Zionist corporation gradually underwent all-round reorganisation in order to be able in the immediate future to establish the closest possible contact with the economic, intelligence, propaganda and military machine of US imperialism.

At this period US capital was intensifying its penetration into the Middle East, and particularly Palestine. There was a sharp growth in the number of Zionist organisations in the USA itself. Faithful to their old tactics of supporting the most powerful imperialist power of the moment, the leaders

of the international Zionist corporation linked their destiny closer and closer with US monopoly capital.

Characterising Zionism in the USA, Eliezer Livneh wrote that US Zionist organisations "promoted not personal participation in upbuilding of the country but political and financial support of a function to be undertaken by other Jews".[57] As a Zionist leader aptly put it, the Zionist dialogue in the USA was one in which an agitator tried to persuade a Jew to go to Palestine, while the latter said that he would do so after the agitator went there himself.

When the Zionist-dominated Second Session of the American Jewish Conference convened in Pittsburg in December 1944, many delegates raised the question of the growth of anti-Semitism in the USA. In his speech M. J. Slonim, representative from Saint Luis, said: "It seems that of all other problems, the problem of the American Scene has stirred the Conference most. The vast majority of the delegates are definitely in favour of including the combating of anti-Semitism in the United States in the programme of the American Jewish Conference. . . ."[58]

But taking advantage of their key positions at this forum attended by representatives of the most diverse political and ideological trends in the American Jewish community, the Zionists led the Conference away from discussion of the problem of anti-Semitism. This elicited the following observation from Rabbi Max Nussbaum: "Is it not absurd that 500 delegates have come together in this year, 1944, to discuss every matter under the sun . . . except the one that is closest to the heart of every American Jew?"[59]

Nahum Goldmann, leader of international Zionism, bluntly stated that the Conference was convened for "what I dare to call a much more important task in Jewish life than the fight against anti-Semitism in America. . .".[60]

Giving in to the will of the Zionist leadership, the Conference completely ignored the fight against nazism and confined itself to a general statement about "the rescue of Jews and others from Axis-dominated countries"; at the same time it adopted a resolution calling for the colonisation of Palestine and another resolution on the post-war "Restoration of Property". The resolution, which advocated the establishment of an International Jewish Reconstruction Commission, noted the need to restore the property of the destroyed Jewish communities, organisations and families,

and already in 1944 laid the foundation for a reparations agreement[61] (blood money) subsequently signed by the Zionist leaders in Israel and the neo-nazi rulers of West Germany.

* * *

The Second World War was over. Nazi Germany was smashed and the red banner of victory hoisted by Soviet soldiers fluttered over the Reichstag. The gates of nazi prisons and concentration camps were flung open. Using devious ways known to few, the remaining nazi chieftains scurried for safety to all parts of the world. But probably not one of them had more concrete and extensive information on the true role and nature of the Zionist backstage machinations during the war years than Adolf Eichmann.

In June 1945, as soon as the war was over, Ben-Gurion arrived in the USA on a special mission. There he had talks with a "group of reliable men" to discuss matters concerning—another war. They talked about the creation of a war industry in the colonised part of Palestine since, as Ben-Gurion said, "the near future might see us locked in combat with the Arab armies". In his *Israel: Years of Challenge* he boasted how "for less than a million dollars we bought machinery worth scores of millions, and it was all safely conveyed to Palestine".[62]

In July 1947, as Minister of Defence, Ben-Gurion issued instructions to the Haganah units emphasising that the Haganah "will be the main factor and the decisive one. Armed Arab aggression can be met only with force, and *no outcome is possible but one brought about by Jewish arms*" (emphasis added—*Y. I.*).[63]

The victory of the pro-US wing in international Zionism had been formally clinched at the 22nd Zionist Congress held in Basle seven months earlier, in December 1946. Announcing that the consolidation of the forces of US imperialism and international Zionism was now complete, Dr. Moshe Sneh, then member of the Jewish Agency, stressed that nothing but US political influence combined with pressure by the armed forces of the Palestinian Jews could force England to comply with their demands.[64] Now that they were openly supported by US monopoly capital, the Zionists' first demand was that Britain lift the ban on Jewish immigration into Palestine.

Simultaneously with an extensive campaign for unrestricted

entry of Jews into Palestine, the Zionist centre, which had moved from impoverished England to the USA, worked hard to "save the Jews" in the displaced persons camps of post-war Western Europe.

The Zionist leaders thought of all sorts of ways.

Rabbi Klausner, for example, in a report to the Zionist-controlled American Jewish Congress proposed (in connection with the Zionist efforts to channel the stream of displaced persons to Palestine) that apart from withdrawing food supplies from persons of Jewish origin the Haganah should be ordered to "harass the Jew".[65]

Louis Nelson, an important US labour leader, reported that Zionist organisations administering the D.P. camps were engaged in a general campaign "to force D.P.s to accept Zionism, to join the Palestine Jewish Army, and to give up legitimate political differences".[66]

US journalist Morris Ernst made public how American Zionists frustrated all attempts to open the USA for Jewish D.P.s or to grant them the right of political asylum in any country of their choice.[67] The Zionists had no intention of losing the "live force" which back in the first years of the rise of fascism in Europe they had come to view as a contingent "subject to re-education" for the subsequent colonial "development" of Palestine.

The international Zionist concern resited its headquarters, reshuffled the serial numbers of its allies, and altered its tactics: but it preserved its old strategic objectives. Characterising these objectives with regard to US conditions, Franklin Roosevelt said: "They [the Zionists—*Y. I.*] know that they can *raise vast sums* [emphasis added—*Y. I.*] for Palestine by saying to donors, 'There is no other place this poor Jew can go.' But if there is a world political asylum for all people irrespective of race, creed or colour, they cannot raise their money."[68]

Lilienthal supplements Roosevelt by writing: "The failure of the powerful and wealthy Jewish American community to launch one objective scholarly study of the causes of anti-Semitism is significant. Neither the religious nor the lay leaders of the many Jewish organisations wish to lose this *potent weapon.* Remove prejudice and you lose adherents to the faith. Make strides toward eliminating bigotry *and funds for Jewish nationalist activities* dry up. Hence, no scientific attack on the problem of anti-Semitism. *This is the conspiracy*

between the rabbinate, Jewish nationalists and other leaders of organised Jewry...."[69] (All emphasis added—*Y. I.*)

Fascism, the centre of militant anti-Semitism from the beginning of the thirties to the mid-forties, was routed. As the Zionists themselves admitted, they needed new, even if artificially created, hotbeds of anti-Semitism. Here is what Ben-Gurion said in this connection: "I shall not be ashamed to confess that, if I had power, as I have the will, I would select a score of efficient young men—intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with the desire to help redeem Jews, and I would send them to the countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction. The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews, and ... *plague* these Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jew', 'Jews, go to Palestine'.... I can vouch that the results, in terms of ... immigration ... would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emissaries who have been preaching for decades to deaf ears."[70]

Recalling the classics of Zionism who considered anti-Semitism a boon, one cannot but note a truly remarkable consistency, as likewise in the matter of qualifying as anti-Semitic any phenomenon preventing them from achieving their Zionist objectives.

A convincing example is provided by Warburg, one of the several authors of a biography of Chaim Weizmann. He pointed out how the Arabs who rose in arms to prevent their country from being handed over to Zionists were regarded not only as political adversaries, but as criminals and were branded as "gangsters and killers" when they began to actively oppose the Jews. "To many Zionists," he went on, "it appeared that some sinister force, possibly anti-Semitic, had invented the Arabs in order to make difficulties for the Jews."[71]

Colonialists rarely keep a statistical account of their crimes, leaving, as a rule, no documentary evidence of what they perpetrate. Nevertheless, it is known that in 1930 29.4 per cent of the Arab families in Palestine were without land. (The report of the Palestine Royal Commission indicated that it had no exact knowledge [!] how many of them had been forcibly evicted by the Zionists.) By 1936 a total of 3,271 applications were registered from evicted Arab peasants[72] (each family consisting of at least five members). How many

families were unable to hand in their applications? How many other applications were not registered?

The Zionist philosopher Martin Buber modestly noted that the Zionists' "basic error consisted in the tribute paid by political leadership to the traditional colonial policy. . .".[73]

If the words "tribute paid" imply the mass forcible eviction of the Palestinian Arab peasants from their land by the Zionists, the suppression by the Zionists and the British of the national liberation movement of the Arabs, the organisation by Ben-Gurion of "shock groups" (under the so-called Federation of Jewish Labour or Histadrut) to terrorise Arab workers, the boycott of Arab goods and the systematic impoverishment of all sections of the Arab population of Palestine, and many other measures to "develop" Canaan, then to a certain extent we can agree with Buber.

Simultaneously with their steps to "save displaced persons", Zionist leaders launched military operations against the British troops in Palestine. Disclosing the real purpose of these operations (sometimes idealised), the Haganah made the following admission in its own newspaper: "It is not the purpose of the struggle to drive the British from this country. The aim of the struggle is to renew the alliance with England. . . . There is, to the best of our knowledge, absolutely no conflict of interests between us and Britain. We are not the slightest bit interested in weakening Britain's position in the world, nor in the Middle East or in Palestine."[74]

The notorious Vladimir Jabotinsky compared the operations of the Zionist armed forces against the British in Palestine with those of the Boers who founded what is today the Republic of South Africa.

These statements require no comment any more than the following admission made by Nahum Goldmann round about the same time: "The Zionists are willing to grant Britain full rights to establish military, naval and air bases in Palestine, in return for its agreement to the creation of a Jewish State on 65% of the total area of Palestine. The establishment of bases in Palestine will also be proposed to the US inasfar as they are able and willing to discharge defence functions there. . . ."[75]

(Much later, at a meeting of the former Haganah leaders in April 1966, Dr. Sneh, who this time strove to prove that the Haganah had "always fought" against British imperialism, received the following rejoinder from Elen Mur, one of

those present: "Despite my admiration for Dr. Sneh's dialectical talent, with which he is extremely gifted, I should prefer it if this talent were directed towards the future rather than the past, since what he has said is disproved by the historical facts.")

By 1947 the Jews accounted for almost 33 per cent of the population of Palestine. Theirs was a heterogeneous, diversified society not only as regards class composition and political convictions, but also from the point of view of culture, national traditions, language, appearance, dress, character, mentality, the climate they were used to, and religious practices—where applicable, for some were atheists. Most of them were indigent. To live they would have to work. They were that "loyal" "live material" which the rulers of colonial powers had hankered after for so many years in their desire to lay hands on the Middle East.

The decisive factors for getting this mass of people into Palestine were British colonialism and later US neo-colonialism each of which accordingly made use of the anti-Semitism of the 1900-1920 counter-revolution in Europe, fascism and the devastation wrought by the war. The Zionists turned both factors to their own advantage and were temporarily satisfied with playing the role of barkers outside an establishment which they owned jointly with their "more respectable" partners.

The overwhelming majority of the Jewish working people who settled down in Palestine had only one "job": they were refugees seeking haven from a real or imaginary danger; and the Zionist leaders had yet to put in a great deal of effort in order to turn some of these people, or rather some of the children of these refugees into nazi-type shock troops.

We should bear all this in mind also in judging the degree of responsibility for all sorts of injustices and crimes which the Zionists and their followers are still perpetrating in that part of the world.

Quite naturally, the Zionist leaders were particularly concerned about the Jewish workers, their growing numbers and increasing class-awareness. "Immigration and colonisation—these are the two Tablets of the Covenant of Palestinian labour," wrote Ben-Gurion in this connection. "Immigration gave us form, and upon colonisation rests our existence, and the two are inscribed in letters of fire and blood on the banner of our movement."[76]

"The Labour Movement," he continued, "has never desired to acquire power in Zionism. Its aim has been not power but *faithful service* [emphasis added—*Y. I.*], and to this end it has striven to unite all sections of the people round the Zionist Movement."[77]

The programme of the "socialist" Ben-Gurion could not have been clearer or more frank: immigration, colonisation (caring little for the plight of the Arab workers) and subjection of the interests of the Palestinian workers to the local Jewish and foreign bourgeoisie.

Preaching that the Jews were an exclusive and chosen people, the Zionists laid the foundation for the Palestinian version of apartheid: "We must restore the values of the dignity of man, the equality and spiritual freedom of man, the sanctity of human life. These are outstanding historical Jewish values. . .,"[78] declared Izhak Moar, one of the tutors of the young generation of colonists. And it was apparently with the aim of restoring these "Jewish values", or rather in fulfilment of the tasks set by Ben-Gurion, that the Zionists, according to A. Lilienthal, artificially and *unsuccessfully* fomented anti-Semitic feelings among the Arabs.

Towards the end of the Second World War the Palestinian proletariat numbered 160,000 Arab and 50,000 Jewish workers. The Arabs and the Jews joined forces to fight against the sermons and actions of Ben-Gurion and others in the employ of imperialism. The number of strike days rose from 24,000 in 1940 to 134,000 in 1942 and 248,000 in 1944, and that according to official figures alone.[79] The strikes were both for economic and political demands.

E. Gozhansky, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Palestine, wrote in 1946: ". . .It was in the period of imperialist provocations, which found expression in mutual boycott and incitement of enmity between the two peoples, that the militant unity of the working class was directly demonstrated in the country. 'Long live the unity of the Jewish and Arab workers,' declared those who spoke at the general meeting of railwaymen in Haifa; the speakers included representatives of railwaymen from Transjordan who joined the strike. Demonstrators in Haifa and Jerusalem carried slogans of Arab-Jewish unity. . . . The railway strike was a formidable rejoinder to the authors of the theory of racialism and national seclusion. . . . Joint Arab-Jewish actions . . . mass actions against imperialism in place of

nationalistic, terroristic adventures—that is the content of our era."[80]

The labyrinth of Zionist politicos and dealers was dark and intricate, and still more intricate and complicated were the manoeuvres of their allies. But life's stream flowed on along the course of objective laws of development which always have the LAST WORD.

Chapter IV

CROSSROADS

On November 21, 1965, the Israeli newspaper *Davar* announced that the nuclear centre at Dimona could produce an atom bomb a year. This report evoked enthusiastic response from certain sections of the Israeli public. At about the same time Israeli movie theatres were running a screen version of Zweig's *Chess Novel.*

We ought not to hurry to the conclusion that here are two entirely unrelated facts.

Andrzei Zeromski, author of *Na zachód od Jordanu* (West of the Jordan), who had visited Israel, wrote: "The *Royal Game* is a screen version of Zweig's *Chess Novel* which relates the story of a professor arrested by the Gestapo. The Hitlerites decide not to subject him to physical torture, but to break his will by psychological methods. For this purpose they completely isolate him from the outside world. There is a scene in the film where the professor, already on the verge of insanity, smashes the furniture in the hotel housing the Gestapo.

"Until that moment the audience were clearly bored and loudly voiced their dissatisfaction. But never, even at the best comedies, have I heard such laughter as accompanied the scene of the professor's madness. The audience roared, stamped their feet and howled. It should be noted that this took place approximately a week before the resumption of the Eichmann trial. In such cases neither orders nor bans are of any help, for it is impossible to order people to understand or to feel."[1]

Here is another testimony, in the form of a document entitled *Confession of a Zionist*, written in 1914 by one of the numerous hard cases of Zionist fanaticism: "Oh, how I would

have liked to fill them [the opponents of Zionism—*Y. I.*] with that venom of destruction which alone fills our insides," wrote a German student from Halle to one of his ilk in Russia. "How I would have liked to pollute them with the stench of our corrupted and putrefying souls. Our enemies ... have emptied our souls, but there is too much smouldering malice and hatred in us. Can it be that this vast potential energy will find no application? Can it be that the great Messiah who would ignite the latent fiery energy with the hell of devastation and hatred will not arrive?"[2]

When the State of Israel was formed, the Zionist leaders who came to power there were very much in need of two categories of Israelis to consolidate their ramified apparatus of coercion: the first, fanatics like the student in Halle and the second, dolts capable of laughing at the sight of human suffering. Consequently, the reaction to such apparently disconnected facts as the announcement about the potential possibilities of the atomic enterprise in Dimona and the film based on Zweig's novel, serve as an indicator of the success of the Zionists' "educational" activity.

Here is a document of a very different kind.

"Nuclear arms will not bring us added security, but the intensification of tension....

"The State of Israel is the one most interested in averting an atomic arms race in our area....

"This problem has another aspect, too.

"The West German ruling circles let it be known at the time that they also have a hand in financing nuclear research in Israel. This revelation, too, is disquieting.

"These very days, the rulers of West Germany and her generals—a great many of whom are unrepentant Nazis—are trying hard to obtain atomic weapons. West German scientists in the service of the Bonn government are using every opportunity, outside West Germany, too, in order to advance in this field...."[3] This statement was made in the Knesset, the Israeli parliament, on December 8, 1965, by the Communist Member Meir Vilner, on behalf of the thousands of ordinary Israelis who support the Communist Party of Israel.

On behalf of the Communist members he moved the following resolution:

"1) Cessation of the military orientation in the work of the Dimona nuclear reactor;

"2) Support for the signing of an international convention for the nuclear disarmament of the Middle East;

"3) Severance of all ties with West Germany in the field of nuclear research;

"4) Expression of strong protest against equipping West Germany with atomic weapons in any shape or form."[4]

The Knesset rejected the resolution by a majority vote. It would have met with a totally different response from, say, the participants in the forum of anti-nazi organisations of Israel, who declared in the same year of 1965: "...We are shocked by this act which is an insult to the memory of those who perished at the hands of the nazi killers. The establishment of diplomatic ties with the FRG is mockery of the feelings of those who survived. Our wounds are still bleeding. Our wounds have not yet healed."

All these problems—involving worries, needs and emotional sufferings—of their compatriots leave the Zionist leaders unperturbed. "We need here [in Israel—*Y. I.*]," declared the prominent Israeli Zionist Jaacov Hazan, at the 23rd International Zionist Congress, "neither Robby Silver, nor Dr. Neiman, nor Rose Halprin. We need their children and grandchildren."

In other words, a nation was needed which would be blindly obedient to the Zionist centre in New York and its Jerusalem branch.

* * *

Are we justified in speaking of an Israeli nation today? To a certain degree, yes. It is in the process of formation, a process which has a long way to go to be completed. The Zionist leaders in power are endeavouring to influence this process by manipulating various economic and political levers. At times their experiments produce unexpected results. "Dr. Emmanuel Newman, a US Zionist leader," writes Zeromski, "regretted the contempt which young Israelis have for the Jews.... Young Israelis visiting the USA avoid meeting local Jewish youth and display utter disregard for them. Even *Herut,* the newspaper of a party of the same name, which usually goes into raptures over the 'magnificent' Sabras,* in this instance shared Dr. Newman's indignation

* *Sabra*—a native-born Palestinian or Israeli Jew.

and regretfully conceded that the Sabras look down their noses on non-Israeli Jews and point to the distinction between the concept 'Israeli' and the concept 'Jew'. . . ."[5]

We can probably agree with the author of *Israel: Years of Challenge*, who asserts that the "Jewish people in Israel is still more potentially than actually a nation. Post-state immigrants have not yet merged wholly into the new nationhood, its economy, its . . . culture", and then adds: "Communities far apart in language and history, in culture and economy, are being made into one uniform nation. . . ."[6]

The author of these revealing remarks—which make the Zionist claims about the existence of a "world Jewish nation" look more pathetic than ever—is none other than Ben-Gurion.

We all know that a common mentality is an essential attribute of a nation, and the Zionist leaders attach primary importance to moulding an Israeli mentality. All school curricula are designed to cultivate the idea that the Jews are a chosen people and to spread manifestly racialist views. At the same time the vicious train of ideas originating in the Bible and propagated by the Zionists for the purpose of leaving a practically indelible mark on the mentality of the rising generation leads up, as a rule, to friendship with the neo-nazis in West Germany.

"During their eight-year compulsory schooling the Israeli children have to devote 1,500 academic hours to the study of the Tanach, Mishnah and the Talmud," writes Zeromski, "and only . . . 20 hours to the study of the geography of foreign countries. It is worth noting that until just recently the geography book presented Germany within the 1937 frontiers, and its authors, Khitov and Arni, sympathised with the Germans who, in keeping with the Potsdam Agreement, were moved from the lands east of the Oder-Neisse line."

What could be more harmless than a visit to the zoo? Yet, it appears that all depends on the time and the place. . . . For example, the zoo in the Israeli sector of Jerusalem displays only those animals which had the honour of being mentioned in the Bible. Apart from the name of the animal, there is a notice bearing a pertinent Biblical quotation on each cage. You are expected to remember and learn as you walk around.

Everywhere in Israel you will see a quotation from the Bible which reads: "This land do I give to them, even to the children of Israel. . ." and each pupil who is taught the Bible from the age of six knows that this land extends "from the

river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates". Here we have both the idea of "greater Israel" and a justification of present and future seizures of Arab territories.

In an address delivered to Israeli Army representatives on October 28, 1958, Knesset Member and Zionist leader Menahem Beigin said: "You Israelis must have no compunction when you kill your enemy. You must not sympathise with him until we have destroyed the so-called Arab culture, on whose ruins we shall build our civilisation."[7]

Ex-Prime Minister of Israel Ben-Gurion impressed the following idea on the students: "The map [of Israel—*Y. I.*] is not the map of our country. We have another map which you students and youngsters in Jewish schools must translate into reality. The Israeli nation must expand its territory from the Euphrates to the Nile."[8]

"Turning our eyes to the north," wrote Menahem Beigin, "we see the fertile lowlands of Syria and the Lebanon . . . to the east the wide rich valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris . . . and the oil of Iraq, to the west the land of the Egyptians. We shall be unable to develop until we have regulated our territorial problems from positions of strength. We shall force the Arabs into absolute submission."[9]

Designed to shape the mentality of the future aggressors, sermons in which biblical veils serve the sole purpose of shrouding bared fangs are enough to compile an encyclopaedia running into many volumes.

Here is another example. "Palestine must belong to the Jews," declared Vladimir Jabotinsky. "The use of appropriate methods for the creation of a national Jewish state will be a permanent and always current element of our policy. The Arabs already know what we must do with them and what we are demanding of them. It is essential to create a 'post-factum' situation and explain to the Arabs that they must get off our territory and go into the desert."

Shortly after the formation of the State of Israel a family which included a boy of ten arrived there from Poland. Five years later the youngster said the following in a conversation with a correspondent of the Israeli newspaper *Od Nowa*: "When an Arab sees a rifle he immediately turns tail. Were it not for the UN, the Suez Canal would have been ours a long time ago. We would have killed them all. But we shall do it yet."[10]

A striking illustration how the Zionists corrupt young

minds by impregnating them with the poison of rabid chauvinism.

At this juncture, it is appropriate to recall the tenet of the Zionist "classic" Nahum Sokolow: ". . .The Jews are doubtless the purest race among civilised nations. . . ." Ironically enough such ideas are injected into the minds of young Israelis, for whom Israel is their homeland whatever the circumstances of their parents' arrival there, from racialist and caste positions in keeping with which each member of the Israeli Jewish community is designated a concrete place in it. "Nowhere in the world is there such a division of people as in Israel—horizontally, vertically, diagonally, in squares and circles. To simplify the issue it is said that the division follows an ethnic pattern,"[11] wrote Zeromski, quoting one of his interlocutors.

Taking up this question in *Israel. Group Relations in a New Society* English historian Alex Weingrod wrote: "The ranking of ethnic groups is one cardinal source of frustrations; that is, the prestige attached to ethnic-group membership provokes disaffection *on the parts of the lower-ranking groups*. . . . The major prestige criterion is the similarity between the immigrants and the veteran European settlers. The closer the conformity, the higher the rank. Europeans, or to use the more common designation, *Ashkenazim*, are ranked higher than Middle Easterners, or *Sephardim*. To come from Poland or Britain is, *ipso facto*, to be more prestigious than to have one's origins in Egypt or Iraq. The rift is fundamental, and it runs throughout the society. There are, of course, gradations within each category. Yemenites, for example, seem to be ranked higher than Moroccans."[12]

Describing the inter-caste tension in the Israeli Jewish community, Weingrod notes: "The most explosive case of communal antagonism took place in 1959, when rioting broke out in several cities. The demonstrators were mainly North Africans: the street mobs—those who smashed store windows in Haifa and Beersheba—were verbally protesting against police brutality and their own bleak residential conditions. But mainly they were disappointed and frustrated by their low position, and angry and resentful against the society that neither sympathised with nor understood them."[13]

Former Prime Minister of Israel Levi Eshkol was capable of spending hours panegyrising the "world Jewish nation"—when he was abroad, that is. On returning to Canaan he

would modestly concede that the eradication of racial and national contradictions and distinctions was "a long process and a matter of generations".[14]

On April 17, 1967 the *U.S. News and World Report* carried an article which contained the following: "A recession has hit nearly every segment of the economy [in Israel—*Y.I.*] throwing 7 to 10 per cent of the labour force out of work.

"At the same time, serious social problems *are growing out of rifts within the Jewish community* [emphasis added—*Y. I.*]. . . . Government experts say many of today's unemployed are Sephardim—so-called 'Oriental' Jews, mostly from North Africa and the Middle East—who blame the Ashkenazim, Jews of European ancestry, for their plight."[15]

"In Jerusalem," wrote A. Zeromski, "I met an interesting man, getting on in years, very knowledgeable and cultured. Strolling through one of Jerusalem's new districts we saw a man of about thirty . . . who was sitting on the pavement drinking arak straight from the bottle. . . .

"Take a good look at him. He is either from Morocco or Tunisia. There he drank his arak, that favourite drink of Arabs, and he drinks it here. He is a recent arrival and still cannot get rid of the habits cultivated over the centuries and handed down from generation to generation. I read *Swiat* and *Polityka*, while he drinks arak in the street. We are both Jews, but what unites us? Nothing. And what divides us? Everything. We don't even talk the same language. . . . Between our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren these distinctions will disappear. It will be they who will make up the new society, already an integral, *no longer Jewish* [emphasis added—*Y. I.*], but an Israeli society."[16]

At this point it will be appropriate to quote the words of Nahum Goldmann, one of the architects of the present system in Israel. "The Jewish people are a unique historical phenomenon. They are simultaneously a nation, a religious entity, a race and bearer of a specific civilisation. Not a single non-Jewish concept of nation and religion can clearly define that unique historical phenomenon—the Jewish people . . . we are a world nation firmly bound up with Israel and are the most inexplicable society in human history. . . ."

The time has passed when the international solidarity of Jewish dealers and the moneybag ideologists in their employ was easily portrayed as a vital function of the "inexplicable"

"mysterious" "world Jewish nation". Life in present-day Israel, the intense struggle of the Israeli working people makes null and void this shrewd stratagem so essential for the Zionist leaders and their patrons. A hundred thousand unemployed on the eve of the Israeli militarists' June aggression stood for 100,000 underfed families out of a total population of 2,600,000. This surely speaks for itself.

The caste system in Israel is a Zionist instrument for dividing the Israeli working people by which the ruling class ensures itself freedom of manoeuvre and effective control and the opportunity to incite and fan racialism spearheaded against the Arabs, a means of toning down class conflicts in the Jewish community and securing at least a temporary alliance of all those who in one way or another seek to gain from the persecution of the Arab minority.

Arab minority.... Let us not mention the time when there were not more than 5,000 Jews in the whole of Palestine, but take the period of the formation of the State of Israel.

In keeping with the UN decision of November 1947, the State of Israel was set up on a territory of 14,000 square kilometres with a population (plus or minus 5,000) of 1,100,000 of whom 600,000 were Jews and 500,000 Arabs.[17]

As a result of the 1948 war Israel annexed 6,000 square kilometres of Arab Palestine with a population of approximately 400,000.

At the beginning of 1949, according to Israeli data, not more than 160,000 Arabs remained on the territory of more than 20,000 square kilometres controlled by Israel.

Under what circumstances and whither did more than 700,000 Arabs disappear?[18] What became of their immovables? Who uses them? Who owns their land now? How many of them were shot as a lesson to others refusing to leave their homes? How many died from disease, hunger, or through not having a roof over their heads?

Let us cite the few facts available from Israeli sources:

The majority of the Arabs were forcibly expelled in the war of 1948 and their villages were destroyed.

On 5.11.1948 the inhabitants of the village of Iqrit in Western Galilee were expelled by force.

On 15.11.1948 the village of Kfar Bira'am was evacuated by force.

On 4.2.1949 the inhabitants of the village of Kfar A'nan

were evacuated, most of them expelled across the border. The village was demolished by the army.

On 28.2.1949, 700 Arab refugees were evacuated from the village of Kfar-Yasif (who settled there after being driven out of their own villages). All were expelled across the border.

On 24.1.1950 the army evacuated by force the inhabitants of Ghabsiya village who were expelled across the border.

On 17.8.1950 the inhabitants of the Arab town of Majdal Ashkelon (about 2,000) were expelled from the country.

Early in February 1951 inhabitants of 13 small Arab villages in Wadi-A'ara were expelled outside the country.

On 17.11.1951 the village of Al-Bowieshat was demolished by the army and its inhabitants expelled across the border.

In September 1953 the inhabitants of the village of Um-El-Faraj were expelled and the village demolished.

On 29.10.1956 men, women and children in the village of Kfar Kassim were massacred.[19]

The world knows only a fraction of the tragedy of the Arab refugees (the above facts are only a cross-section of that fraction). But with time all details will come to light.

On New Year's Eve 1968, a prominent Arab intellectual, one of the 300,000 Arabs currently living in Israel, showed to a group of acquaintances a document which was issued to him by Israeli officials on the basis of the Defence Regulations introduced by the British authorities in 1945. Without this document he had no right to travel to his place of employment situated 30 kilometres away from his home. The permit indicated the time of arrival in the closed territory and the length of stop-over there, the names of accompanying persons and the numbers of their identity cards. The bearers of the permit were allowed to travel by road only and to stop at places and for the time indicated in the permit. Persons with such permits were forbidden to do anything that was not shown under the Purpose of Trip heading. They were not allowed to change whereabouts without the permission of the officer in charge, and so on.

Whoever has seen the permit issued to Africans by the "white" administration in the Republic of South Africa, will immediately note the striking similarity between the two.

This kind of permit was issued to people allowed to travel from one closed zone to another. Why these "closed zones"? Because of secret military installations? Nothing of the kind.

Since the establishment of Israel her ruling circles proclaimed all territories inhabited by the Arabs "closed zones". The military and police regulations enforced there are reminiscent of the regime established for the "inferior races" on the territories once occupied by nazi Germany.

It will be remembered that the (emergency) Defence Regulations, a law under which in 1968 the Arabs were issued permits with 17 obligatory conditions, and under which any Arab in Israel can be subjected to house or any other form of arrest for an indefinite period, was introduced by the British colonial authorities in Palestine in 1945. On seeing the controlling block of shares of the Zionist corporation for the "development" of Palestine disappearing across the ocean, Britain extended these harsh regulations not only to the Arabs and the progressive Jewish settlers, but also to Zionists who openly supported US capital. Let us also recall how Zionist leaders described these very regulations at the time when they were directed against them.

Israeli Minister of Justice Ja'acov Shapiro, who later turned the Regulations of the British colonial authorities into a norm of life and behaviour for the Arab population, characterised them in the following terms on February 7, 1946: "The regime which came about with the introduction of the Defence Regulations in Palestine has no similarity in any civilised country. Even in Nazi Germany there were no such laws, and the actions of Maidanek and the like were even against the written law. Only one form of regime is similar to these circumstances—it is the status of an occupied country. However they try to calm us that these Regulations are intended only against the law-breakers and not against the citizens in general, but also the Nazi ruler of occupied Oslo declared that nothing bad will happen to a citizen who will follow his ordinary business only.... We have to declare before the whole world: The Defence Regulations of the Palestine Government are destroying the foundations of law and justice in the country."[20]

At the end of 1962 Israel signed an international convention condemning discrimination in public education.

However, as the bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel on the situation of the Arabs in Israel says, the Arabs (11.5 per cent of the Israeli population) account for not more than 2.9 per cent of the secondary school pupils (1965-1966). Only 300 Arab students are enrolled at the country's institutions of

higher learning, i.e., 1.5 per cent of the total student body in Israel.[21]

"There is not a single agricultural school for young Arabs," writes Zeromski, "and that despite the fact that the majority of the Arabs live and work in the villages. School premises are in a deplorable condition. Owing to a shortage of classrooms, studies are often conducted in the open. Arab schools rarely have desks and the children have to sit on the ground during lessons."[22]

On the land problem, the Communist Party of Israel has this to say: "The confiscation of land from the Arab peasants is one of the clearest examples of the Government's anti-Arab policy, discrimination, and oppression of the Arabs. The Zionists' well-tried practice of securing plots of land for Jewish settlers still continues, except that now it is defended by the Government under the pretext of 'security requirements', 'development' and 'the defence of state property'.... The appropriation of millions of dunums of land belonging to Arab refugees driven from the country was not enough: now the land of the Arab peasants who managed to remain in Israel has become the object of an uninterrupted process of appropriations and confiscations.

"Since the establishment of the State, the government... took various measures including the enactment of many laws —sometimes gross ones and sometimes subtle ones—to deprive Israeli Arabs of their lands. Over one million dunums (a dunum is 1/4 of an acre) have already been confiscated one way or another from Arabs living in Israel."[23]

... At midday on January 31, 1966, mobs of fascist-minded hoodlums in Natanya brutally beat up all the Arabs who were in the streets at the time. Those concerned spread the usual rumour, which naturally was never confirmed, that the "Arabs had killed a Jew". These outrages, instigated in cold blood, continued for a long time; the police was in no hurry to interfere.

In response to the violence done to many of their comrades, Arab workers from the neighbouring villages staged a demonstration and then went on strike. The authorities promptly qualified the actions of the Arab workers as a mutiny "provoked by Arab nationalists".

Exposing this lie, the Arab Communist Member Emile Habibi declared in a speech in the Knesset: "The inhabitants of Taiyiba and Kalansav were protesting against the Govern-

ment's policy of discrimination, which inevitably leads to such results (outrages against the Arab population). The workers of Taiyiba and Kalansav, as indeed the workers living in other villages, are well known for their truly proletarian education. Their Jewish fellow-workers know them, work with them and struggle together with them against the same exploiters. When the municipal workers went on strike in Ramat-Gan last year, the municipality tried to find blacklegs among the Arab workers, but was unable to find a single Arab worker willing to steal bread from his comrade, the Jewish worker.

"Last Monday, as we all know, the workers of the Bay of Haifa, Jewish and Arab together in the spirit of brotherhood and solidarity, declared a strike in protest against the rising cost of living, demanding a wage increase.

"We have complete faith in the Jewish working class of Israel, and trust in their proletarian ethics. . . ."[24]

Defending the honour and dignity of the Jewish working people, Emile Habibi emphasised that "the hoodlums who committed the outrages in Natanya can on no account be said to represent the Jewish people of Israel".[25]

In May 1965, in a conversation with the mayor of the Israeli sector of Jerusalem I deliberately asked him whether there were many sweethearts in the city.

He seemed to like the question. "Oh, yes," he replied. "Probably more than anywhere else in the world."

But he was at a loss when I asked him whether as mayor he could tell me how many mixed marriages were registered in the city over the past year. (Love does not discriminate between Jew and Arab.) It would have been easier to find this out from the registration offices on Cyprus which are frequently approached by Israelis unable to make their marriage legal in their own country.

There are very few mixed marriages in Israel, but the number is steadily increasing in defiance of the official policy of the ruling circles who are concerned with the "problem of racial purity". This process, naturally, does not affect the privileged classes and is rooted in the working people; the example is set by progressive sections of the Israeli population which are devoid of racial prejudices.

In this connection the views of Zeromski's interlocutor about the future of the Israeli nation in the conversation we quoted earlier are somewhat incomplete (making allowance

for the affected tone of superiority). In our opinion the Israeli nation when fully formed would be a natural amalgam of the communities and peoples of modern Israel.

* * *

The main purpose of the Israeli version of apartheid is to help the Zionists practise the old policy of the ruling class of colonial England. Are there any other reasons for the establishment of apartheid in Israel?

Yes, there are. And they are particularly manifest when the problem of the role and place of the State of Israel in the system of international Zionism is studied in its entirety.

To this day the World Zionist Organisation (WZO) remains Zionism's chief organisational and ideological centre. Founded in 1897, with headquarters in the USA, it is patterned along racial lines and possesses financial funds equal to those of the world's biggest monopoly associations. The WZO controls and directs the work of Zionist concerns in more than 60 countries, and its directives determine the activities of the World Jewish Congress (which is, in effect, its branch) in 67 countries. These two major Zionist organisations have numerous affiliated societies, clubs, provisional or permanent committees, unions and associations.

Nominally, the World Zionist Congress, whose delegates are appointed, is the highest organ of the World Zionist Organisation. The Congress elects the World Zionist Council made up of representatives of all Zionist organisations and parties functioning in different countries. The World Zionist Council elects the World Zionist Executive Committee with headquarters in New York and Jerusalem. The Committee has 12 departments each directing a specific field of the WZO's activity (from intelligence to "cultural and religious education in the Diaspora").

The Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation is, in fact, an executor of the will of a small group representing the interests of some of the largest US monopolists most of whom are of Jewish origin.

If need be this group can justify their diktat to the WZO by mentioning an impressive number of members of US Zionist organisations which is approaching the total number of Jews in Israel, i.e., the existence of a large "army" of US Zionists who have never shown any inclination to move to

the Middle East. The numerous US Zionist organisations prepared to applaud the Israeli ruling circles and finance their ventures include the B'nai B'irth Organisation with a membership of 500,000, the American Jewish Congress with 300,000 members, the Zionist Organisation of America with 100,000 members, and the Hadassah-Women's Zionist Organisation of America with 300,000 members.

But the real power of WZO leaders is determined not by the number of American Zionists, but by the cheque books of the US and affiliated West German, South African and other multi-millionaires.

As befitting a solid international concern, the WZO is one of the biggest owners of property in the capitalist world. Let us take a brief look at what it owns in Israel alone: 86 per cent of the leased agricultural land; "trusteeship" of more than 480 agricultural settlements in Israel and, in 1963, sole or joint ownership of 60 of the country's enterprises. It owns the Rural and Suburban Settlement Company Ltd. (Rassco), one of the biggest building companies in Israel, is a shareholder in Mekorot, a leading company engaged in promoting hydroworks, El Al Israel Airlines Ltd., operating international services, ZIM, the Israel Navigation Co. Ltd., the country's biggest, and so forth.

It is also necessary to say a few words about the main sources of foreign capital flowing into Israel (for 1948-1959): the USA (loans by the Export-Import Bank of Washington; assistance with agricultural surplus products)—$557,300,000, or 16.5 per cent; Jewish (i.e., Zionist—*Y. I.*) funds, mainly from the USA—$848,700,000, or 25 per cent; State bonds marketed chiefly in the USA—$334,600,000, or 10 per cent; loans from foreign banks and private capital, mainly from the USA and France—$770,100,000, or 22.7 per cent; West Germany (financing of the state or private persons in the form of compensation)—$725,300,000, or 21.4 per cent, and so forth, to the total sum of $3,386 million. If we take as a basis the first half of 1960 when the value of the immovables owned by expelled Arabs amounted to $560 million, the aggregate capital for the 12 years under review amounted to $4,100 million, or $340 million a year, or about $1,000,000 a day.[26]

This daily financial injection of the Israeli economy was maintained at the same exceedingly high level right up to the beginning of the Israeli aggression in June 1967, when

it rose sharply. It should also be noted that by 1967, 200 US companies were functioning in Israel.

Considering that Israel has a population of 2,600,000, that the country's territory within the illegal 1948 frontiers is slightly over 20,000 square kilometres, and that there are 163 relatively large business concerns, the above data clearly indicates that Israel's economy is in effect controlled by the international Zionist corporation, and through it by US, West German and other (non-Zionist) monopolies.

In the light of the foregoing it is but natural that international Zionism, international imperialism's most consistent ally, should view Israel not only as its offspring but also as its property.

This stand of the Zionist leaders can be considered logical and as designating Israel's place in the system of Zionism only if we accept as Israel her ruling circles, which were always a part of and submissive to the will of the Zionist corporation, if we accept as Israel her state and administrative apparatus and military machinery built up stage by stage in keeping with international Zionism's long-term targets. It is this Israel, the Israel of militarists, political gamblers and bigots, which, in accordance with the will of the real rulers of the international Zionist concern (not its administrators or travelling salesmen of the Goldmann variety), is to fulfil at the present stage three basic tasks that are to determine its role in the system of international Zionism:

to transform the State into a marauding beast of prey capable of using violence to control or effectively determine the course of developments in the Middle East (whose vital importance for imperialism cannot be overestimated)*;

* Investments by US corporations in Middle East oil and their profits:

Year	Direct investments ($ mln.)	After-tax profits ($ mln.)	Rate of profit on invested capital (per cent)
1963	1,207	825	68.3
1964	1,240	893	72.0
1965	1,491	813	54.5

"These are average figures for the whole area," wrote S. Astakhov in an article entitled "More about the Secret Springs of Israeli Aggres-

to further consolidate Israel as a centre of political and ideological influence and, if possible, of control over millions of Jews living in different countries;

to strengthen Israel's positions as an instrument of imperialism's economic and political penetration (under the Israeli flag) of the developing countries of Africa and Asia (and some other countries).

Events in the Middle East and in Israel herself over the past twenty years show how zealously the Israeli ruling circles are endeavouring to fulfil these tasks.

The $8,000 million, which, as officials announced, Israel received in the first two decades of her existence[27] (a sum far greater than that received by any other country "patronised" by the "Free World" leaders) indicates that imperialism has embarked upon a serious and dangerous adventure in the Middle East. Another $9,000 million to be paid out in the period from 1967 to 1975 prove that this adventure will be just as serious and purposeful in the future.

Twenty per cent of the total Israeli budget for 1966/67 was earmarked for settling various financial obligations and paying interest on loans[28] (and about 40 per cent went to cover direct or indirect military expenses). Therefore, whatever the speed-up system imposed by the Israeli leadership on urban and rural workers and agricultural co-operators dependent on Zionist banks, the many years of hard work put in by the working people will not be enough to redeem even a part of the promissory notes issued by the Israeli ruling class to its imperialist partners. And realising this, realising it better than many Israelis, the Israeli ruling class makes no secret of the fact that it intends to cover its debts by rendering specific services to its creditors.

In January 1968, at the height of Israeli outrages on the Arab territories occupied in the course of the treacherous June aggression, Levi Eshkol, former Israeli Premier, told President Johnson: "A strong Israel presents the US with its only hope of preventing a further increasing Soviet weight in the Middle East."[29]

---

sion" (*International Affairs* No. 10, Moscow, September 1967), "but it should be emphasised that in Kuwait, for instance, the average annual profit of the oil monopolies comes to 500 per cent of capital investments. According to data in the Western press, US monopolies have been earning $ 1,200 million and British monopolies $ 600 million a year on Arab oil!"

In its forecast for 1968-1969 the newspaper *Haarets* wrote: "Israeli circles: a fresh round with the Arabs is possible in the near future."

This is the change offered by the Israeli militarists, the practical guarantee of their "good intentions", their attempts to fulfil one of their three basic tasks.

Millions of Israeli pounds (and that in conditions of unemployment) are lavishly expended by the Israeli authorities on the propaganda of the idea of a "world Jewish nation", on sermons summoning the Jews to rally around Israel and give all-round support to the actions and military gambles of the Israeli ruling circles. And since imperialism is vitally interested in the activity of the Israeli propagandists, a large part of the billions of dollars flowing into the "promised land" finds its way into the latters' pockets.

The Israeli version of apartheid (Ashkenazim-Sephardim-"goy"*-Arab) plus an elaborate system of brutal racial discrimination against the Arabs serve the same purpose. They are a component part of the policy pursued by the Zionist elite of the World Zionist Organisation and Israel in the formation of a so-called centre of influence—a "Jewish centre" (and not the State of Israel inhabited by Israelis).

The Zionists are doing their best to hinder the natural process of the formation of the Israeli nation. They obviously have no need for a consolidated Israeli nation which already now, at the very outset of its formation, is showing signs of indifference to Zionism, as well as to Germans, Englishmen, Russians or Italians of Jewish origin.

"Since not a single person who could express the views of the new generation has been invited to this Congress [26th Zionist Congress in Jerusalem—*Y.I.*]," declared Uri Avneri, editor of one of the most popular magazines in Israel, "I shall do it myself.... The Congress you have organised here is an alien and obnoxious phenomenon for us; we do not know what Zionism is.... It spins among us like a living corpse and addles our mind. And not only our mind but all our administrative rules, the political system and the problem of *our national existence*" (emphasis added—*Y. I.*).

The leaders of international Zionism can do neither without the ruling class now in power in Israel, nor without a privileged caste of emigrants from countries where the

---

* Gentile.

wealthiest and politically influential Jews are living (Europe and America). Ostensibly this caste personifies Israel as a whole, for, according to Zionist psychologists, it is only in the name of people of their own kind that a specific section of Jews in Europe and America will continue their donations (i.e., filling the Zionist coffers) and demonstrate their backing for the idea of "dual citizenship".

This is another important element of the Israeli version of apartheid.

Yet we know that it is possible, at best, to temporarily retard a process but not to stop it altogether. Attempts to do so inevitably lead to an explosion.

This thought involuntarily comes to mind after reading the reasonably objective information about the situation in Israel published by *Newsweek* in 1965: "Since 1948 more than 1,200,000 Jews have immigrated to Israel; they have come from 94 countries, speaking 70 languages. And with the mass immigration has come what is called 'the second Israel'—the 60 per cent of the country's 2.5 million population of Sephardic or Oriental origin. These are the Jews from North Africa, Asia and the Middle East whose cultural and social outlook is vastly different from that of the Ashkenazim or European Jews.... The income of the Orientals is barely three-quarters of the National Average...."[30]

But the gap goes further than dry statistics. The European Jews treat the Eastern Jews with contempt. "You just can't expect the same kind of work from a *frenk* (a pejorative term for an Oriental) as you can from a European Jew," said one Polish shopkeeper. " 'Sure he's a nice boy,' said one Israeli mother about her future son-in-law. 'But he's a schvarze (a black man). He comes from Libya and is no better than an Arab.' Then, bringing her fingers to her lip, she almost pleads: 'Please, don't tell the neighbours.' "

According to *Newsweek*, "many Oriental Jews ... have been embittered against the European Jews. 'The Ashkenazim want to keep us down,' says David Hakham from Iraq. 'We are the base and they are the top. We came to Israel to escape discrimination. Instead, we find it here.' 'They're trying to culturally exterminate the Orientals,' says Michael Selzer, a radical spokesman for the Sephardic cause. 'They're trying to change Sephardim into Ashkenazim. *They don't realise that they are sitting on a time bomb.*' " (Emphasis added—*Y. I.*)

Here is another aspect of the activity of Israeli theoreticians

and those directly working for the "solution" of the national question.

"To this day it has not been decided who should be considered a Jew," writes A. Zeromski. "But there is no doubt who should be considered a 'goy'. Moreover, the men are subjected to the most humiliating procedure.... The Israeli weekly *Od Nowa* published in Polish by the Mapam Party carried a story related by an Israeli citizen. Here it is word for word: 'I was asked into a separate room. I was ordered to take off my trousers and the careful, thorough inspection began. At last the sickening silence was broken by the words: 'He's a Jew, alright.' Where and when is this taking place? In Warsaw? In Lodz? In 1941? 1942? 1943?... No, in Israel, in 1960. In Yavne Street on the premises of the honourable organisation known as the 'Court of the Rabbis'. When? I have already said: 'in A. D. 1960.... Twice in my life my trousers were taken off to ascertain whether I belonged to the chosen people: once in the ghetto before being sent to Oświęcim, the second—here, in the Jewish state....'"[31]

Let us now see how Israeli ruling circles are fulfilling the third of the basic tasks set them by the leaders of the international Zionist concern.

A relatively short while ago a large hotel and several blocks of flats, which were rented or sold at fantastic prices (their construction cost $20 million) were built in Abidjan, capital of the Ivory Coast.

In financing the project, the Israeli millionaire Ecostiel Federmann demonstrated "not in words but in deed" the willingness of Israeli businessmen to promote the economic "emancipation of the developing countries". Federmann personally appointed a certain Willie Schlener a manager of his hotel.

Later certain intriguing facts connected with this seemingly ordinary affair came to light: it became known that Federmann's business affairs in Africa were conducted by a secret company called Popina which was registered in only one country, Liechtenstein, and its list of shareholders was said to be secret.

Despite the veil of secrecy two very significant facts leaked out: 1) although Federmann appeared to be playing the leading role in this undertaking, 25 per cent of his own shares passed into the hands of the company's undisclosed shareholders and 2) the man whom Federmann appointed hotel

manager was identified as an active nazi and former assistant to another prominent nazi Albert Speer who had been tried at Nuremberg and sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment.

It is significant that millionaire Federmann was recommended to African governments by the Israeli Government, and Golda Meir, an experienced participant in all the machinations of the Israeli leadership, asked Federmann to lend his activity in Africa a genuinely Israeli character.[32] And that was precisely what he did.

From 1959 to 1965, 4,640 Africans went through a course of study in Israel.[33] Most of them were given an agricultural education and were taught the art of "rising to leading positions in the working-class movement of the native population".

This profession is taught at the Afro-Asian Institute for Labour, Economics and Co-operation founded in Israel in 1959 by the Histadrut (which is both a collective entrepreneur and communication channel with foreign capital) and the American Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organisations (AFL-CIO). Israel's ex-Ambassador to the USA and Britain Eliahu Elat and AFL President George Meany were appointed co-directors of the Institute.

In his book *The Central Intelligence Agency and the American Trade Unions,* US journalist George Morris describes the Afro-Asian Institute in Israel as a centre of US intelligence activity conducted with the encouragement of US trade union bosses.

Not long ago the Israeli Government announced that a great historic honour had fallen to the lot of Israel—one which is also a duty—that of helping the backward, primitive peoples to improve and advance.[34]

Michael Brecher, in *The New States of Asia. A Political Analysis*, also speaks about this mission, but defines the Israeli Government's statement in a single terse phrase: "...The desire to serve as a bridge between the former colonial powers of the West and former dependent territories."[35]

Above we have given a brief account of the place and role assigned to Israel in the system of international Zionism by the imperialist forces and also of the urgent tasks now being set to Israel by the powers that be. Plainly obvious Israel's role as a shock unit of Zionism and the tasks this involves fully coincide with the interests of her ruling circles. But the same does not fully apply to the place she has held until recently in the system of international Zionism.

It is quite probable that the intentions of the Israeli ruling circles to create a "greater" Israel (which, in our opinion, should be viewed with all seriousness and due vigilance) arise from their desire to introduce certain changes into what is for them a fundamental issue. The place of a junior partner, that of a boy who starts a fight, no longer suits the pretenders to the "throne" of a Middle East "Israeli Empire".

The recent removal of Nahum Goldmann from the post of President of the World Zionist Organisation was apparently the result of pressure on the part of the Israeli Zionist leaders aspiring to a leading place in the international Zionist concern. Most likely the new president of the WZO will be elected from among their number, which, naturally, would be a practical step towards the realisation of the Israeli Zionists' long-standing plans for gaining control over the forces that are at present controlling them.

* * *

Each year on May 9 thousands of Israeli working people, Jews and Arabs alike, gather in Red Army Forest situated near Jerusalem. There, at a plain stone, a monument not deigned worthy of attention by Israeli sculptors, they mark the Day of Victory over nazi Germany and silently pay tribute to the memory of the fallen Soviet officers and soldiers who shouldered the main burden in the fight against the Hitlerite hordes.

It is these working people, Israeli internationalists, who annually observe the victory over the forces of reaction, with which Zionist leaders collaborated in the past and are doing so today, who are more aware than any other of their compatriots that the road along which the Israeli leaders are leading the country can end only in an unprecedented national disaster. "Our internationalism and patriotism are inseparable," declare the true representatives of the Israeli people. "The government's policy is not only anti-Arab, anti-communist and pro-imperialist. It is also anti-national, *for it holds a clear menace to the people of Israel and their future* [emphasis added—*Y. I.*]. Considering the situation in the Middle East and the world, this policy stands absolutely no chance of success."[36]

The tragedy of present-day Israel is that by no means all her people have grasped the essence of the policy of the ruling

circles and the role of the international Zionist concern in programming this policy to suit its own interests and the interests of its imperialist partners. A considerable number of Israelis still do not see, or for reasons of their own refuse to admit that the international Zionist concern and the Israeli Zionist leaders have unfortunately done much to turn Israel into an obedient tool of their policy that is completely at odds with the interests of the people and the country.

The imposing assortment of Zionist parties in Israel, ranging from the Mapam, whose programme contains the words "dictatorship of the proletariat", to the Herut which had long since been calling for an Israeli-bred Mussolini, is intended to satisfy the most diverse political tastes of the Israelis, to make them swallow the particular legend about Zionism which each party is painstakingly elaborating.

The polemics between all sorts of Zionist representatives in the Knesset (in intervals between acts of aggression against the Arab states) wax white hot and each rank-and-file member of a particular Zionist party notes with satisfaction how astutely his deputy "gave it" to a (no less Zionist) opponent.

But it has been happening increasingly of late that the Israeli convinced that Zionism is merely a "labour re-education of the Jews for the purpose of returning them their good name", as some of its "Left-wing" agitators assert, suddenly finds himself marching with his bayonet fixed in line with representatives of other Zionist organisations whose convictions and spirit are alien to him, while his deputy occupies a chair of honour in the "national coalition government" and noisily obstructs those who speak up in defence of the honour and dignity of the Israeli people.

June 5, 1967, the Knesset (verbatim report)

M. Vilner. The Eshkol Government . . . started today a war against the UAR. . . . No enemy whatsoever could do more damage to Israel than this government. . . . The war will not resolve even one of the problems disputed between Israel and the Arab states. The war yet deepens the problems more and causes unforetellable damage to Israel in the region and in the international arena. . . .

The American and British imperialists only are interested in this war, in order to keep their petroleum concessions and their military bases in the area at the cost of the blood of our sons and daughters. . . .

(At this point of M. Vilner's speech he was interrupted by continuous and hysteric shouts from all benches.)

T. Toubi. The war . . . is an open aggressive act. . . .

M. Vilner. . . .This is a war waged against the real interests of Israel.

(The interruptions and shouts continued and grew even stronger. The speaker, Kadish Looz, tried to quieten down the interruptions.)

T. Toubi. You will not be able to quieten the voice of the Communist Party, the voice of the Jewish and Arab Communists, because this is the voice of peace and it is stronger than your shouts! . . .

(. . .Shouts were started again. . . . Some of these shouts were of a cheap anti-Soviet character.)

M. Vilner. The Soviet Union stands for peace. The people of Israel will be still in need of the help of the Soviet Union, in order to get Israel out of the disaster you are pushing her into.

June 26.

M. Vilner. . . .We stand here today as we stood in 1956 . . . (during the 1956 aggression—*Y.I.*).

M. Biram (Right-wing Zionist). Shame to you! (Hysteric shouts from all coalition benches.)

M. Vilner. You will bring a catastrophe to the nation. You will bring a catastrophe on our people! We try to save the people of Israel from your adventurism. We want security for Israel, we want peace for Israel, and not military adventures in the service of the USA and Britain. . . .

(Shouts.)

M. Vilner. . . .Children, old men, women carrying remnants of their belongings had to leave their houses within few hours without any preparation, without any alternative lodging. . . . Is this not cruelty towards the civilian population? . . .

M. Cohen (Alignment). Stop this propaganda against the Government of Israel.

M. Vilner. I am saying these things in the interest of the State of Israel.

M. Cohen. You are an inciter!

M. Vilner. Anti-Semitism never served a people. Not those who did this against the Jews and not the Jews who are doing this now against the Arabs. . . .

Disregarding persecution and the chauvinist hysteria courageous Israeli Communists are telling the truth to the

Israelis knowing that only the road of peace will lead them to a future where security, mutual respect, co-operation and friendship of all the peoples of the Middle East will be the norm.

"Ours is a policy of national salvation," Meir Vilner emphasised: "it indicates the only way of solving the difficult problems confronting the Israeli people. Our Party is working for a united front that will bring together all peace-loving Israelis who, irrespective of political views, insist on evacuation of the occupied territories and on a peaceful settlement on the following basis:

"1) Withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied parts of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria as a necessary step towards a peaceful and just settlement based on mutual respect of rights, including Israel's right to exist.

"2) Recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs, and primarily the rights of the Arab refugees, in accordance with the UN resolution."[37]

But the Israeli leaders would not heed the voice of reason.

1967.... "There is an increasing number of reports about the atrocities and acts of violence committed by the Israeli invaders on the occupied territories. What is taking place in the Sinai Peninsula and in the Gaza Strip, in the western part of Jordan and in the Syrian lands occupied by Israeli troops, reminds us of the monstrous crimes perpetrated by the fascists in the Second World War...."[38]

1968.... The military budget is being upped more than 20 per cent, and the police budget 15 per cent, allocations for education are being cut 24 per cent and public health and social welfare 25 per cent.[39] "Our task is to create a greater Israel," declared Israeli Minister of Labour Yigal Allon in an order authorising settlement on the seized Arab territories.

"Guns before butter", "Greater Israel", "Living space"—what a familiar tune. What a killing resemblance in every sense of the word.

"Why didn't Moshe Dayan shudder when he uttered the words inciting the terror of recollections," the Israeli writer Amos Oz declared publicly in sincere bewilderment following one of the general's frequent public statements. "For 'living space' is nothing more than a demand to expel a people to have its place taken by a 'more civilised' nation.... Why did Dayan resort to a terminology used by our enemies to justify their persecutions against us, the very same terminology,

which, having fallen off the lips of the nazis, became a synonym of filth for all freedom-loving peoples of the world?"[40]

While Amos Oz is merely bewildered by Moshe Dayan's shocking terminology, there is a growing number of people in Israel whose sense of duty and justice revolts against the criminal actions of the Israeli militarists. Possessed of a fine sense of responsibility for the destiny of their homeland, these people swell the ranks of the militant opponents of the wild schemes of the Israeli rulers who are leading their country towards disaster.

"An end should be put to the violation of human rights in Israel and in the occupied territories." This is demanded by distinguished Israeli writers, scientists, journalists, poets together with workers, students and people from other walks of life. "More and more Arabs are being expelled from the West Bank [of the Jordan—*Y. I.*] on the orders of the Israeli Military Governor," reads their declaration of protest. ". . .Domination over another people dooms the oppressors themselves to moral degradation. . . . A nation oppressing another nation inevitably forfeits its own freedom and the freedom of its citizens. . . ."[41]

It cannot be overlooked, however, that there is a category of people in Israel who think otherwise.

A fairly large Zionist-controlled organisation called the Israeli Peace Movement circulated in many countries its own memorandum entitled "The Six Day War Was on the Part of the People of Israel a Defensive War for Israel's Very Existence".

The memorandum was also circulated in the USA. Replying to the authors of this document and the forces behind them, Gus Hall, General Secretary of the United States Communist Party, wrote in his open letter:

"No matter how often you say it, an aggression does not become a 'defensive war'. You cannot deny that it was the armed forces of Israel that attacked Egypt, Syria and Jordan. You cannot deny that it was the bombers of Israel that dropped bombs on these countries. You cannot deny that it is the armed forces of Israel that still occupy large sections of the soil of the three Arab countries. You cannot deny that the government of Israel has taken steps to incorporate these sectors as a part of Israel. . . .

"The root of the crisis in the Middle East is oil. The governments of the Arab countries have increasingly and

justifiably insisted on a greater share of the wealth extracted from their oil. The US and British Governments, and especially the C.I.A., have been very busy making one attempt after another to overthrow these Arab governments....

"To support the aggression by Israel is not supporting Israel.... Mankind will not accept your apologies for Israel's aggression. *The people of Israel will also be judged by how they fight against the unjust policies of Israel....*"[42] (Emphasis added—*Y.I.*)

Today, when the venom of chauvinism (of which the Zionist centre is busy producing a concentrated solution round the clock) has affected many people in Israel, it would be worth while to remind those who are still prepared to cure themselves of addiction to the Zionist drug, who are still concerned with the future of their homeland and their children, who have not yet learned to laugh at the sufferings of Zweig's heroes, who have not forgotten nazi camps and who aspire to human dignity, of the bitter, grave and honest words of the appeal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany of June 11, 1945. For the Israel of today it is more than a historical document—it is a direct warning:

"All those Germans who saw in the armament policy 'the greatness of Germany' and who accepted the wild militarism, marches and military drill as the greatest boon for the nation bear the blame. It was our misfortune that millions upon millions of Germans followed in the lead of nazi demagogy, that the venom of the bestial racial theory of the 'fight for Lebensraum' was able to poison the organism of the people. It was our misfortune that broad sections of the population lost their sense of human dignity and justice and followed Hitler because he promised them a good dinner and supper at the expense of other peoples as a result of war and plunder."[43]

The total Zionisation of Israel, further military adventures for the sake of the international Zionist concern and its imperialist allies, adventures pregnant with the most dire consequences, and the search for "living space" is one road.

"Not with imperialism against the Arab peoples, but with the Arab peoples against imperialism" is the other road.

The choice has to be made: there is no avoiding it.

THE FUTURE WILL SHOW HOW MUCH COMMON SENSE THE ISRAELI PUBLIC POSSESSES.

Chapter V

CAUTION: ZIONISM!

In 1928 Jacob de Haas, Theodor Herzl's habitually circumspect secretary, succumbed to the temptation of revealing an aspect of Zionist activity which is most highly valued and financed by the "powers that be", and one that is carefully concealed and denied by the Zionists themselves:

"A real organisation does not exhibit all its strength on parade, though that . . . form of demonstration was not overlooked when the need arose. The great strength of the American Zionist organisation was in the multifariousness of its contacts and in the accurate knowledge of those in control of the human resources on which they depend. Did the British need to obtain a contact in Odessa, or were they in need of a trustworthy agent in Harbin? Did President Wilson require at short notice a thousand word summary detailing those who were in the Kerensky upheaval in Russia? The New York office rendered *all these services* [emphasis added—*Y.I.*], asking for nothing but receiving much, the respect and good will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs. Thousands of Zionists everywhere served, and served well in that far flung line which the organisation maintained."[1]

De Haas, an ideological kinsman of the darkest forces of international reaction who endeavoured to cast a slur on all Jews, forestalled by many years the author of a much shorter utterance defining a basically identical approach to the same issue: "Everyone can be a spy. Everyone must be a spy. There is no secret which cannot be discovered."*

Let us cast another swift look at the basic positions of Zionist classics whose conceptions are fundamentally opposed

* A thought expressed by Rudolf Hess, a nazi leader.

to the interests of the working people. "The Jewish national idea," wrote Nahum Sokolow, "involves the struggle of all, irrespective of their level of education or party adherence on all questions that concern the Jews and Judaism. . . ."

Thus it is not the founding and the existence of the State of Israel that is the cornerstone of the Zionist motto "Judaism above all", but the more than seventy-year-old aim of subjugating world Jewry to the will of the pro-imperialist Zionist centre by any means available. It is not the appearance of Israel as such, but the consolidation of the ruling Zionist clique at the top of the Israel social pyramid that has become a highly favourable attendant factor of the international Zionist centre's corruptive activity. And it is this activity which international Zionism (while retaining its leading positions) is farming out in present conditions and in a certain measure to the Israeli ruling circles.

"British Intelligence, employing something like 3,000 people, and Israeli Intelligence employing some 300, make a far more accurate assessment of matters bearing on US policy . . . than our over-staffed intelligence agencies,"[2] wrote Hanson Baldwin, *The New York Times* military observer, concerning the activity of the three intelligence services in the Soviet Union. Let us leave Baldwin with his calculations which merely show that the Soviet Union is not the sort of place where this activity can be conducted at will, and note the principal thing: "Israeli Intelligence [a component of the intelligence of the international Zionist centre—*Y.I.*] is doing its utmost to gather military, political and economic information in the socialist countries, particularly in the Soviet Union."[3]

The specific activity of the Zionist intelligence service, which is but one area of Zionist activity, is, however, not the subject of our concluding chapter. In it we should like to make a brief study of the tactics and methods employed by international *Zionism* in its efforts to realise the general programme concisely formulated on June 2, 1967, three days before Israel's aggression, by Chief Rabbi of Britain Dr. Immanuel Jakobovits (among other things the realisation of this programme would provide a base for intelligence activity, too): "We must make sure there will not be a Jew anywhere in the world shirking his duty. . . . Young people . . . must be ready to fight . . . at a telephone call from Israel, be will-

ing to go there to man essential jobs left vacant by the military mobilisation of Israeli citizens. . . .

"The rest should be ready to contribute to a per capita tax on every single Jew to help Israel's economy. . . . If they want us we will be there at their command. . . ."[4]

(In our opinion there is only one other person in Britain who puts forward his thoughts in such a peremptory manner typical neither of the English language nor English traditions; that man is the fascist Mosley.)

So Jakobovits mentioned neither Britain, France nor the Soviet Union, but frankly stressed the global nature of the tasks now being set via its professional and voluntary agitators by the international Zionist centre for the purpose of safeguarding and consolidating imperialist positions.

So that it may not be thought that Jakobovits's statement was a single isolated case, an "irresponsible" declaration by one individual, let us take a look at a much earlier utterance by Ben-Gurion which in a way discloses the essence of what Jakobovits said: "This means aiding Israel whether the government of the country in which the Jews are resident and of which they are subjects likes it or not. . . . When we speak of a single Jewish nation we must ignore the fact that the Jewish nation is scattered throughout the world and that the Jews living in any place are citizens of their country of residence."[5]

Naturally, all working Jews for whom the interests of the Zionists and their imperialist patrons are absolutely alien, sweep aside such recommendations.

On the same day, June 2, 1967 (a coincidence?) the Zionist newspaper *Israelitisches Wochenblatt* published in Switzerland carried an appeal of the World Zionist Organisation which outlined both the Zionist action programme and the means to be adopted for its realisation:

"The existence and the security of the State of Israel are being threatened. . . . The entire population of Israel is aware of the danger looming over it and is fully determined to endure any sacrifice. All (Jewish) sections of the population, *regardless of their country of origin or party affiliation*, have in these difficult times unconditionally placed their services at the disposal of the State of Israel. Expressions of sympathy and assurances of complete solidarity which we are receiving from all Jewish communities are an additional source of courage and trust for the population of Israel in the *coming*

struggle. But the situation is aggravating and there is no saying how long this will continue.

"At this decisive moment," the authors of the appeal exclaim in tones faltering with emotion (having already issued their instructions to the crews of Israeli bombers), "we appeal to our brethren in the Diaspora to strengthen ties between Zion and the Diaspora, and *mobilise the sympathies and active support for Israel among all the peoples of the world* [all emphasis added—*Y.I.*], to increase donations [!], persuade the younger generation to emigrate to Israel and to work instead of those who for the sake of defending their country are standing along her frontiers, sincerely and to the maximum exert their material resources [!], furnish financial assistance [!] and thus bear the extraordinary hardships imposed on Israel. The size of financial [!] means needed in this crisis cannot be set in advance, but in any case they are very considerable. . ." (!) and so on and so forth.

A study of this appeal reveals three fundamental factors indicating the trend, nature and methods of Zionist activity.

First, Zionist leaders, representatives of the class of wealthy pro-imperialist or imperialist bourgeoisie, base their propaganda for the Jewish masses in all countries on the allegedly indisputable "affiliation" if not the blood kinship of Jews throughout the world whatever their "country of birth" or "party affiliation", *ostensibly disregarding the question whether or not a certain section of citizens in different countries accepts the Zionist conception.* This approach is by no means as senseless as it might appear. On the one hand, it relieves the Zionists of the need to prove the existence of such "affiliation" (which spells nothing good for them in view of the unequivocally negative attitude of the working Jews, especially those living in socialist countries, to this idea), and on the other hand, it gives all Jews opposing Zionism the status of temporarily deluded souls who should be treated carefully, kindly and with the greatest restraint as one would a demented person. This, so to say, is the front line of Zionist activity.

Simultaneously, they execute two enveloping manoeuvres to inject the virus of discontent among the working Jews with their environment and keep them in a state of constant uneasiness. Presenting a "new" programme to the 26th International Zionist Congress, Nahum Goldmann clearly indi-

cated the need to create such a situation when he said that the Jewish people should be made to realise that they must shake off their complacency and begin to think seriously about their future.

Both manoeuvres are based on the old concept of the "exclusiveness" of Jewry which the Zionists are propagandising in a much more veiled form than previously in view of the changed situation.

One of these manoeuvres is in effect inculcation of what could be termed "fatalist complex" which might be illustrated briefly as follows: "You are not an office manager but a clerk because you are a Jew. You are not the company director but his deputy because you are a Jew. You are not a minister but a deputy minister because you are a Jew," and so forth.

There is no denying the potential effectiveness of this manoeuvre designed to whet ambition, all the more so in that it is greatly strengthened by a purely racialist counter manoeuvre whose essence is skilful injection, frequently by cat's-paws, of the idea of the "extraordinary", "outstanding" "capabilities bordering on genius" of all Jews compared with all other peoples.

In this case, the Zionists do not confine themselves to "pure" propaganda or "historical excursus", but allow themselves the luxury of mentioning Jesus Christ, and also Karl Marx whom they loathe. Having vast sums of money at their disposal, they resort to bribery and advertising to inflate the prestige of those people who can render the best service to their cause.

In the past hundred years it is only the nazis and the Zionists who have "enriched" civilisation by elaborating the idea of the "undoubted superiority" of their "national genius". But if the nazis sought to impose this idea on the people through crude violence, the Zionists, armed with the "theory of small deeds", are doing the same thing surreptitiously and with much greater "efficiency".

(We should note that the concept "world Jewish nation" which Marxism rejects torpedoes the Zionists' efforts to use in furtherance of their shady objectives the names of the truly gifted people whose brilliant minds were nourished by the national cultures of the Arab East, Spain, Italy, France, Germany, Britain, Poland, Romania, Russia and America and who had never dissociated themselves from their native soil.)

It would be stressed that these measures are but a few of the variations performed by the Zionist propaganda bandwagon, but we consider them the basic ones. Multiplied by more than 70 years of daily effort they cannot be regarded as harmless and deserve the most serious attention.

The second essential factor of the above appeal of the World Zionist Organisation is the direct instructions of the Zionist leaders to "mobilise the sympathies and active support for Israel among all the peoples of the world".

This appeal leaves a lot unsaid.

Taking into account the existence of powerful Zionist organisations in the USA, Britain, France, Scandinavia and Latin America and also the Zionist leadership in Israel, the psychological warfare experts of the international Zionist centre are just as concerned, and sometimes more concerned with brainwashing the non-Jews in the pro-Zionist spirit than with conducting work among their "adopted kin". Success in this activity, they believe, will also bring a section of Jews who categorically reject Zionism to contemplate or even capitulate.

One of the most important measures employed by the Zionists in this sphere is economic blackmail.

The following example will amply illustrate the effectiveness of this sort of pressure. "...The Lebanese and Syrian Americans, *because of business connections* [emphasis added —*Y.I.*], give far bigger contributions to the United Jewish Appeal,*" writes A. Lilienthal, "than they donate out of conviction to the appeals for the Arab refugees."[6]

At one time 199 synagogues in America and Canada summoned people to purchase Israeli bonds sold directly on their premises, thus forcing many Jews into directly participating in this and many other financial operations.

Zionists throughout the world own 1,036 periodicals. Nonetheless, their leaders attach paramount importance to installing their agents or "sympathetic elements" into the central press in all countries, into the foreign services of broadcasting stations, into the cinema industry and television. Zionists never underestimate the role played by these powerful levers in indoctrinating public opinion since they know very well

---

* A Zionist organisation engaged in raising funds for Israeli ruling circles.

that such "trifles" as composing an article of long primer and placing it next to a dramatic photograph, or composing it of nonpareil and hiding it away at the bottom of the second but last page sometimes make all the difference. Better still they know that any noble idea which contradicts their views can be discredited through endless mechanical repetition until people will stop taking it seriously, or by lauding it with honeyed phrases which can easily be explained away by claims that this was done "with the best of intentions".

It is common knowledge that Zionism holds no threat for US imperialism and since this is the case it is all the more useful to examine how Zionist agents operate even in the citadel of their allies.

In *The Other Side of the Coin,* A. Lilienthal takes a close look at the activity of the Zionists in the US press, particularly in *The New York Times,* a paper with one of the largest circulations in the country. Incidentally, its overseas circulation is steadily growing and 72 newspapers in the USA, Canada and other countries use its news service.

Lilienthal describes the methods employed by the Zionists in *The New York Times* to impose specific point of view on its readers, and has devoted his book to illuminating this extremely ugly "side of the coin".

In April 1956, Lilienthal writes, Senator Kefauver seeking nomination for the Presidency sought to take advantage of the pro-Zionist sentiments of a part of the country's population. In response to his demarche, some prominent public leaders issued a statement to the effect that the Senator had jeopardised US national interests and that his reshuffle of the domestic and foreign policy was impermissible. This statement got eight lines in *The New York Times* which on the same day (April 23, 1956) frontpaged Ben-Gurion's criticism of Eisenhower's refusal to send arms to Israel.* On the third page it had a photograph of Israeli children emerging from an underground shelter with the caption: "Youngsters were evacuated from nursery minutes before it received a direct hit early this month." On the tenth page it carried a report on the annual conference of the Brooklyn Council of the Jewish Community, and so forth.

---

* At the time the US sent arms to Israel through various NATO partners.

In May 1961, when Ben-Gurion came to see Kennedy, *The New York Times* devoted three columns to the news beneath a photograph of the two leaders capped by a running title, and only one column to the news that Kennedy was leaving (on the same day) for Europe to take part in a conference.

Lilienthal writes that he selected *The New York Times* on account of its being one of the most influential newspapers in the USA and by no means because it was unique among US newspapers in its pro-Zionist orientation.

It is not only US reality that offers hundreds of irrefutable facts testifying to the carefully planned purposeful activity carried on by Zionists on radio and television, in literature and literary criticism, in the theatre and the cinema, and many other fields that influence man's world outlook.

To return to Lilienthal.

...What can a librarian do? A great deal: recommend a book for example. What book? Any book. John Reed's *Ten Days That Shook the World*, Lion Feuchtwanger's *Jud Süss*, Lev Tolstoi's *War and Peace*, Irvin Shaw's *Young Lions*, etc.

Lilienthal notes that "Princeton, allegedly a stronghold of Arabism" in the USA, is a small college town whose public library is a vivid example of Zionist influence on the education of the young people. Its catalogues list the works of all known Zionist and pro-Zionist writers who had ever written anything about the Middle East and Palestine. In a conversation with Lilienthal the librarian made the following most revealing remarks: "We have a most active Jewish community here.... They carry on several programmes in which they co-operate in our work. They are very kind and generous in their gifts of books."[7]

The last but not the least important factor clearly indicated in the Appeal of the World Zionist Organisation is money.

Reading the above-quoted excerpt from the Appeal one cannot fail to be struck by the repeated mention of "financial assistance", "donations", "to the maximum exert your financial resources" and other "variations on the financial theme".

Putting it briefly, without any special calculations (which could have been made on the basis of information from different countries) the dollar sums which the international Zionist concern and Israel's ruling circles received during the latest aggression against the Arab states are enough to cover the cost of several further ventures of this kind.

Where did these billions come from? The lion's share was lifted from the pockets of American, British, French, South African and other working people by Zionist or pro-Zionist industrialists, bankers and gold-mine owners and transferred to the strong rooms of the Zionist centre, while the remainder was donated by the "middle class" and Jewish working people thanks to the constant mass efforts of Zionist propaganda.

Are such contributions in the interests of those who, voluntarily or involuntarily, make them?

Why did the US ruling circles pass a law exempting from taxation all "donations" (however fantastic they might be) in aid of Israel?

Why is it that in Britain, shaken by the devaluation of the pound and losing hundreds of millions of pounds a month through the Israeli blockade of the Suez Canal, hundreds of millions of pounds are successfully raised by the Zionists to keep the canal closed for as long as possible?

Yes, there is food enough for thought.

* * *

The cardinal objective of the international Zionist concern has been and continues to be enrichment at whatever the cost, enrichment, which guarantees them power and a parasitical well-being within the imperialist system;

the establishment of ideological and political control over the Jewish section of the population, which in the indefinite future is promised the role of pastor of mankind, has been and continues to be one of the chief means of achieving this objective;

formed as a result of the humane act of representatives of many peoples of the world, the State of Israel, owing to the anti-national, perfidious policy of its Zionist ruling circles and in the person of these circles, has been and continues to be the tool of the "holy alliance" of international Zionism and imperialism;

the main targets of the subversive activity of the international Zionist concern (both within and without the framework of its daily financial and political machinations that clash with the national interests of all peoples without exception) have been and continue to be the Soviet Union, all socialist countries, the international communist, working-class and national liberation movement.

The campaign against the socialist community, and against the Soviet Union in particular, is being conducted under the ragged banner of "protection of the Jews". How many political adventurists have marched under this banner and how many honest but credulous people have, if only for a moment, held it aloft, deluded into doing so by the strenuous efforts of the Zionists.

The form of this subversive activity aimed at creating the bases for the work of all kinds of agents of imperialism is by no means devoid of sense, for some people might well think that since they are being so vigorously protected perhaps, after all, they really do need protection.

Let us, however, turn to a less philosophical question: What conclusion could be drawn from the fact that the neo-nazis in Bonn organise a "week of solidarity and defence" of the Israeli Zionists, while the latter organise a "week of solidarity and defence" of Soviet Jews?

It certainly defies all the laws of formal logic that Kurt Kiesinger, member of the nazi party since 1933 (party card No. 2633930), a prominent figure in the Third Reich's propaganda apparatus, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, where, according to 1967 figures, some 100 undisguised neo-nazi centres are preaching anti-Semitism, has, together with like-minded persons and colleagues in the government, become an active supporter of the Zionist cause of "defending the benighted and inferior citizens languishing behind the iron curtain".

This gives rise to two questions. First, is such a dubious situation a diplomatic victory for Israel? Second, are there any secondary, collateral reasons (apart from the main objective—establishment of ideological and political control by the Zionist centre) impelling the Zionists to moan at all the crossroads of the world about the "unfortunate" destiny of the Jews in the USSR?

Yes, there are, and I should like to give a brief account of the most essential one.

In May 1965 a journalist asked a Zionist leader of average importance on a sightseeing tour of Haifa the following question: "Please, tell me, why is it that you persist in your efforts to secure the emigration of Soviet citizens of Jewish origin to Israel? There are twice as many Jews in the USA, yet you're making practically no efforts at all in that direction."

"If I give you a frank answer, you, as a journalist, will be bound to mention my name and raise a scandal," he replied after a pause. However, he was assured that nothing of the sort would happen.

The conversation was not conducted in private and those present will recall that his reply ran as follows: "In your country Jews are working people and as such are relatively unexacting. Since it is a matter of developing sparsely populated territories, both factors suit us perfectly."

It was pretty difficult to link this up with a later statement by Eshkol: "We must explain to the whole world, including the Arab world, that one way of solving the issue is fully and absolutely out of the question—it is impossible to settle Arab refugees in Israel ... for Israel 100,000 refugees would be tantamount to having an atom bomb dropped on us."

But further collation of facts, figures and developments made the frankness of the statement by the Zionist in Haifa more and more obvious.

In the 20 years of her existence 250,000 Jews, of whom the overwhelming majority were of European extraction, emigrated from Israel.

In the 20 years of Israel's existence each American Jew paid approximately $250 a year as "smart-money" for refusing to move to faraway Palestine.

In the 20 years of Israel's existence her ruling militarist circles have, as a result of their aggressive actions, seized (and are intending to "develop") a territory approximately four times the size allotted to the country under the UN decision.

In the 20 years of Israel's existence her authorities have forcibly expelled about a million Arabs from the country (between 1948-1950) and hundreds of thousands more during the June aggression.

If we recall Theodor Herzl's words, "Our unskilled workers ... will move first of all from the large Russian and Rumanian reservoir ...", if we take into account the fact that this was said about 70 years ago and that technology has developed immeasurably since then, and if we bear in mind Ben-Gurion's recent dramatic appeal for an immediate mass emigration of European Jews to Israel we shall see that in the light of the above facts the statement, "in your country Jews are working people and as such are relatively unexacting. Since it is a matter of developing sparsely populated

territories, both factors suit us perfectly", appears to be absolutely sincere.

Such cynicism on the part of the Zionist leaders can only be regarded with contempt by the working people of the multinational Land of Soviets. All those working energetically for the benefit of the Soviet people will not allow the Zionist leadership to sneer at the Soviet Jews, their comrades in work and in struggle, who share their convictions and are dedicated to the communist cause, socialist society and their homeland.

The Zionists constantly change the tactics of their ideological and other forms of subversion against the USSR.

To further its specific plans the international Zionist centre in 1961 called for "a moderate line" towards the USSR and other socialist countries.

In March 1963 the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation rejected the "moderate line" and called for an "offensive campaign" against the socialist community, particularly the USSR. Nahum Goldmann, speaking of the general aims of Zionism, declared that the WZO should become a political task force capable of defending the rights of all Jews living outside Israel.

In July 1964 Zionist leaders vamped up their directives and stressed the need for "constant pressure on the Soviet authorities" with the help of "non-Jewish forces".

In 1965 there were signs of yet another tactical reorientation. Some Zionist leaders in fact conceded that frontal attacks, including unbridled anti-Soviet smear campaigns, failed to produce results and recommended "enveloping manoeuvres".

In 1966-1968, as was evidenced in particular by events in Poland and Czechoslovakia, the international Zionist centre once again reverted to large-scale overt provocations.

In their "total war" the international Zionist centre resorts to such worn stereotype methods as Voice of America and Kol-Israel broadcasts, illegal dissemination of Zionist literature in the Soviet Union, the dispatching of Zionist periodicals to Soviet citizens whose addresses are known in Israel (without their permission) and parcels of matzoth (although it is common knowledge that Soviet bakeries produce enough matzoth a month to build a second Mount Ararat or Zion). There are other methods, less striking but more venomous:

dissemination of provocative rumours, encouragement of mercantilism and clannishness, provoking a big fuss out of anything that is remotely anti-Soviet, juggling with facts quoted in memoirs and other literary works, and supporting all those who either deliberately, or due to their youth or stupidity are actually or potentially capable of being led by their rope.

Zionist leaders attach particular importance to the revision and misrepresentation of Marxist-Leninist ideas, falsification of the history of the Soviet state as the basic means of ideological struggle against the USSR and communism as a whole.

What suits Zionism least of all is the Marxist-Leninist theories of what is a nation, the scathing criticism to which the founders of communist ideology subjected the concept of the "world Jewish nation" and the way Marxists pose and resolve the so-called "eternal Jewish question". Day in and day out, for many years now the Zionists have been waging their both open and secret war against the heritage of the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

Foreign Zionists and pro-Zionists are recommending and "justifying" the need to revise Marxism, and their apologists in the socialist countries without much ado set about various juggling acts.

M. B. VOLFSON

"The way many theoreticians and activists of the Second International interpret the Jewish question has nothing in common with the Marxist-revolutionary interpretation. First it should be noted that they did not pay sufficient attention to this question and to the national question in general. And when mass violence against the Jews ... in capitalist society forced them to speak up they treated the Jewish question either in the spirit of emancipatory liberalism or in the

V. I. LENIN

"That is precisely what the Jewish problem *amounts to*: assimilation or isolation? —and the idea of Jewish 'nationality' is definitely reactionary not only when expounded by its consistent advocates (the Zionists), but likewise on the lips of those who try to combine it with the ideas of Social-Democracy (the Bundists).... Karl Kautsky, in particular reference to the Russian Jews, expresses himself ever more vigorously. Hostility towards non-native sections of the population can only

spirit of Jewish nationalism. Characteristic in this respect was Kautsky's statement. . . . What solution does he offer for the Jewish question? In effect he calls for assimilation, since hostility towards the Jews 'will be eliminated only if and when the Jewish sections of the population cease to be alien and blend with the mass of the population'."

(*Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya*, Vol. 24, Moscow, 1932, p. 154.)

be eliminated 'when the non-native sections of the population cease to be alien and blend with the general mass of the population. *That is the only possible solution of the Jewish problem, and we should support everything that makes for the ending of Jewish isolation*'. Yet the Bund is resisting this only possible solution for it is helping, not to end but to increase and legitimise Jewish isolation. . . ."

(V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 101.)

Seven years after Lenin's death Volfson pretended to have "forgotten" the Leninist tenet: "The best Jews, those who are celebrated in world history, and have given the world foremost leaders of democracy and socialism, have never clamoured against assimilation. It is only those who contemplate the 'rear aspect' of Jewry with reverential awe that clamour against assimilation."[8]

Having frightened the reader with the fact that Kautsky was one of the inglorious leaders of the Second International, Volfson straight away falsified Lenin's idea. A few lines further, as was to be expected, he "rebuffs" the supporters of "colonisation of Palestine", the Zionists. But the *main thing* was already achieved. "*The main front* of our struggle at the present time," Levi Eshkol stressed, "which is more important than at any other period in our history, is the home front. Assimilation and decentralisation constitute a threat to our further existence."[9]

And this is how things really stand. The national process of the assimilation of the Jews observed in all countries, just as the process of the natural consolidation of the Israeli nation, for very obvious reasons categorically did not suit and still does not suit the international Zionist concern. Its agents, ideologues and paid propagandists continue to erect, as they have in the past, the most diverse obstacles, both

theoretical and practical, to prevent these processes from taking their natural course to completion.

A vivid example of the intrigues of international Zionism in the communist and working-class movement was the recent attempt to undermine the internationalist positions of the Israeli Communist Party, to replace its Marxist-Leninist, genuinely patriotic policy with a policy of actual alliance with Zionism and solidarity with the criminal gambles of those advocating the establishment of "greater Israel".

Founded in 1919, the Communist Party of Israel has every reason to be proud of its revolutionary traditions, its long and arduous path of day to day struggle for the rights and interests of the Israeli working people. Forged in the grim conditions of artificially fomented national strife, the international Jewish-Arab unity of the CPI members, the fraternal co-operation between the Jews and the Arabs united in the Party on a class basis, is the object of the legitimate pride of the Israeli Communists, a magnificent example of the indivisible community of interests of all the working people of the Middle East.

The great achievement of the Communist Party of Israel and its Central Committee was that the internationalism of the Israeli Communists was able to withstand and overcome the social-chauvinism of the splitter group which in 1965 attacked the Party under the smoke-screen of demagogic phrases calling for "Israelisation of the Communist Party" and expounding the need to follow a "more flexible tactical line".

Exactly two years after the unsuccessful attempt to divert the Communist Party of Israel from its Marxist-Leninist course of defending the Israeli people's true national interests, those who suggested "more flexible tactics" literally demonstrated their own "flexibility" by bowing to Zionist audiences applauding their qualification of the Israeli aggression as "the most just of all wars known to mankind".

But the Communist Party of Israel has been put to the most rigid test of all recently. Having failed to shatter the Party from within, the Israeli authorities resorted to numerous repressions against the Communists from such refined methods as the baiting of their children in school and in the street, to the traditional arrests of Party activists and leaders, brutal beatings up at police stations and attempts to assassinate leading Communists.

The Communist Party of Israel continues to work in most difficult conditions. In Israel and elsewhere the Zionist and pro-Zionist press is increasing its hate-campaign against it. There are hysterical appeals to ban the Communist Party, and proposals are being drafted for a new electoral system in Israel aimed solely at depriving the Communist Party of having its representatives elected to parliament.

Displaying composure and courage, the Israeli Communists are continuing to fight for the genuine interests of the people, for peace and a just solution to all outstanding issues between Israel and the Arab countries.

The Zionist parties in Israel, who form various temporary and permanent alliances for the purpose of staging at regular intervals the gaudy spectacle of "forming an Israeli government" have established Zionism as the official state ideology. But in the opinion of Zionist supporters, and according to their plans, this ideology should not flourish in Israel alone. And while the defeated splitter group in the Communist Party of Israel was to have played the role of a Zionist agent in the international communist movement, the so-called socialist (Zionist) parties in Israel have been assiduously fulfilling this assignment for a long time in the world's Social-Democratic parties, widely using for the purpose the rostrum willingly offered them by the Socialist International.

How fruitful this activity of the elite of Zionist "Social-Democracy" has been and how fertile the soil of the Socialist International on which it was conducted, can be judged by the special resolution passed in the first days of the Israeli aggression at an Emergency Meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International on June 8, 1967. There is no need to quote the entire resolution adopted by those who had organised the struggle for the cause of reform capitalism. Suffice it to cite the first and the last paragraphs of this document, "socialist" in form but imperialist in content:

"The Socialist International expresses its full solidarity with the people of Israel who are defending their existence and their liberty against aggression. . . . [?!]

"The Socialist International allies itself with the democratic forces in the Middle East, in their fight to repudiate all forms of feudalism and dictatorship. The Socialist International will work to bring the advantages of democratic Socialism to all the countries of the Middle East."[10]

It is the Israeli Zionist leaders in the Socialist International

who are putting in a great deal of effort to "bring the advantages of democratic Socialism" with the help of bayonets or promissory notes. It is the Zionists who have elaborated the programme of the Centre for Socialist Thought established "to study the various trends within the international Socialist movement today and the application of their programmes and methods of action in developing countries. . .".[11]

Paragraph 5 of the Zionist memorandum which accompanied the proposal to set up the centre recommends the following: "To engage in dialogues concerning problems of Socialist ideology and practice with parties both in Asia and in Africa which" do not "belong to the Socialist International. . . ."[12] All this shows that international Zionism's ideological subversion is conducted on a broad front and planned for years ahead. The same is true of the military, intelligence and economic activities of the international Zionist concern.

It should be stressed again and again that in opposing the Soviet Union, the entire socialist community and the communist and working-class movement, Zionism is bound to struggle against the national liberation movement too. In this struggle an important role is still being played by its well-tested tactics of *faits accomplis*, particularly in the Middle East area.

What else, apart from crude violence and blatant sabotage, enables Zionism's allies to employ these tactics with temporary success in international organisations that are called upon to ensure peace and justice with all the means at their disposal?

It is not enough to say that Zionism owes this temporary success among other things to a smoothly functioning misinformation and propaganda service on an international scale, and leave it at that. Let us try to see just how it works.

We have already noted how in preparation for the latest Israeli aggression, the international Zionist centre, employing all the means at its disposal, managed to condition a certain section of the Western public in favour of the aggressors and in effect to neutralise another large section of it.

The aggression was accomplished, and unfortunately it was only *post factum* that a large number of people in the world came to realise what had actually taken place in the Middle East and the baseness of falsehoods which were pre-

sented as "information about what is taking place". The occupation of considerable Arab territories which were immediately qualified as "liberated territories", killings, terror, maltreatment of the civilian population, destruction of Arab dwellings, forcible eviction of hundreds of thousands of Arabs from their homeland and categorical refusal to comply with the UN decisions concerning the status of Jerusalem have had a sobering effect on many, and have led the misguided to make a radical reassessment of events.

What is Zionist propaganda doing now that the scales of world public opinion have obviously tipped in favour of the Arab states, the victims of the aggression? The propaganda manoeuvre undertaken by international Zionism in the new conditions may be termed the "tactics of searching for the truth".

Of late a vast number of "investigations" have made their appearance in the USA, Britain, France, Italy and other countries in the form of brochures, books, extensive reviews, and analytical reports "taken from personal archives" and "brought to light for the first time". They invite the reader "to calmly examine the facts and finally arrive at the truth". The friendly tone, the refined manner of submitting mistakes and obvious failures on both sides, hundreds of names, thousands of dates and situations, a play of varying shades of controversial views, frequent recourse to humour as a means of engaging the reader and getting away from the point, subtle flattery for the reader as an intellectual capable of understanding that, of course, there is no such thing as being absolutely right or guilty, and, finally, the conclusion deduced in the best traditions of the time-hallowed (but no less bourgeois for the passage of time) objectivism: life is manifold and, as we have shown, complicated, therefore take it easy, don't rush: it would be best to weigh up and take stock of everything again, to argue more often, for truth will out in argument.

Thanks to considerable effort, support and careful handling, this mode of thinking is gradually gaining ground, all the more so since many of the authors paid to put out works containing such ideas are carefully chosen as having been progressives in their time.

Meanwhile, the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem is being actively Israelised with the help of funds initially set up by Rothschild, the World Zionist Organisation and the

Ambassador of an "allied power"—the Federal Republic of Germany. Meanwhile 70 kilometres from Damascus, a village of Israeli "farmers" armed to the teeth is rising on ancient Syrian territory. Meanwhile thousands of indigent Israelis are being resettled in the occupied regions so that the Israeli leaders will be able to say, as they did in 1948: "What resettlement are you talking about when Israeli working people have already been living for so long on the lands of the so-called refugees?" Meanwhile the manager of the Zionist trust, Nahum Goldmann is making innumerable trips in an effort to settle things peacefully and have everything remain as it is—the farmers, and the fishermen angling in turbid waters. Meanwhile....

* * *

David Gavish (b. 1924), native of Minsk, graduate of Jerusalem University, Israeli diplomat and professional secret agent, was on a plane bound for Vienna. The instructions he had received before leaving testified to his being extremely well-trusted. Only one thing upset him: why was it that he, an expert authority on the socialist countries, had not been invited to attend the last routine meeting, which had discussed the matter of purchasing a large shipment of spare parts and ammunition for arms captured from the Arabs? Gavish was greatly disturbed by the suddenly increased authority of his Sinologist colleagues.

Every criminal remembers more and more frequently and clearly as time goes on his first victim. Gavish remembered Dolnik....

But let us interrupt Mr. Gavish's thoughts for a moment and tell in the plain, unadorned language of a document of the activities of one of his Moscow underlings.

"*Summary of material on Dolnik S. B., arrested and convicted for anti-Soviet activities.*

"May 26, 1966, Dolnik, Solomon Borisovich, native of the town of Rudnya, Smolensk region, non-Party, cartographer by profession, was arrested on Article 70 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR....

"Investigations revealed that in 1965 Dolnik had established contact with members of the staff of the Israeli Embassy in Moscow (Gavish, Bartov, Govrin, Biran, Katz, Ravé) and given them various material ordered by the

Israelis.... Dolnik generally made contact with the Embassy staff at the Moscow Choral Synagogue which he visited regularly. Dolnik photographed the material he had collected in order to simplify the transfer....

"In collecting the slanderous information the Israeli Embassy also requested, Dolnik resorted to direct forgery. Thus, in the summer of 1965, he fabricated a photo-copy of so-called "facts" of anti-Semitism in the USSR. Dolnik photographed several tombstones in the Jewish cemetery and touched them up with swastikas....

"For the various information he handed over to the Israelis Dolnik received material rewards in the form of parcels of articles supposedly from a brother resident in Israel...."

The aircraft aboard which Gavish was flying from Tel Aviv to Vienna, landed on the dot with true German punctuality.

The Main Documentary Centre has existed for some time in the Austrian capital. The name is sufficiently vague to mean anything and provides a good cover for the activities of a large espionage organisation created by the International Zionist Organisation and the CIA (USA), acting in many cases under orders from the Israeli Embassy in Vienna, whither, as it happens, our "diplomat" was bound. However, before going on to describe the latest action of the little-known Documentary Centre, it is necessary to return once more to events of the recent past.

In 1951 a Czechoslovak court condemned William Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, to 10 years imprisonment for espionage. In September 1968, the magazine *Newsweek* wrote about him, and mentioned the fact that he had had extremely wide connections in Czechoslovakia among Jewish nationalists.

Oatis was by no means the only Western agent who had tried to find accomplices in the Jewish communities of Brno, Bratislava and Prague. According to the Czechoslovak press Israeli Zionist diplomats had been equally active for many years in attempting to carry out subversive activities in the interests of their imperialist allies. In 1957, a Secretary at the Israeli Embassy, Moshe Katz, was expelled from the country for actions not in keeping with his position as a diplomat. It was common knowledge that the Embassy Second Secretary Karl Aaron and his successor Itzkhak Shalef had tried all

kinds of means to achieve the departure from Czechoslovakia (for political and other reasons) of outstanding experts of Jewish origin.

In protest against the 1967 Israeli aggression against the Arab countries, Czechoslovakia, along with several other socialist countries, severed diplomatic relations with Israel. The Zionists were thus deprived of the possibility of carrying on their activities in the country through the agency of their diplomats. International Zionism thus felt the need to adopt a manoeuvre intended to artificially stir up world public opinion against socialist Czechoslovakia on the so-called Jewish question.

In the autumn of 1967, Charles Jordan, an active figure in the World Jewish Congress, arrived as a tourist in Prague. Soon after, his body was found in the river and the Zionist press in all 67 capitalist countries where it is legal was howling about "anti-Jewish outrages" and the "brutalities of the Czechoslovak secret police".

After this the general public was treated to the death of two doctors—members of the International Concilium—invited from Switzerland by the Czechoslovak authorities to investigate the causes of Jordan's death. The doctors met their death far from Czechoslovakia, in circumstances somewhat reminiscent of the death of Oswald Lee, Jack Ruby and other witnesses deemed "undesirable" by the imperialist secret service.

The real aim of all the shady activities conducted by the Zionists in Czechoslovakia on the eve of the attempts by the forces of reaction at home and abroad to overthrow socialism in the country is clearer today, now that with the aid of the fraternal socialist countries, the Czechoslovakia has eliminated the danger that threatened her in August 1968.

It should be stressed that Zionist activities in Czechoslovakia were, naturally, but a part of the activities undertaken by internal and external forces of counter-revolution. A leading role in the Zionist activities was to be played by the inconspicuous "Main Documentary Centre" tucked away in Vienna. On the eve of the events in Czechoslovakia the Centre created a "daughter enterprise", the Committee for Czechoslovak Refugees. It is significant that almost simultaneously a Centre for the Co-ordination of Fighters for the Freedom of Czechoslovakia was set up in Israel (which must have seemed a rather strange move, surely, to the

ordinary Israeli, for whom the main thing in 1968 was the Israeli-Arab conflict).

But the Zionists are not wont to take into account the mood of the ordinary Israeli. The Tel Aviv Zionist newspaper *Maariv* revealed the nature of the Centre's activities in a routine report of October 6, 1968.

"Yesterday the Co-ordination Centre sent a group of young Czech intellectuals resident in Israel to various European countries. The group's task is to establish contact with Czechoslovak citizens outside the country. They are also to investigate the possibility of establishing contact with various groups inside Czechoslovakia. Part of the group is to go to Prague."

"The Co-ordination Centre in Israel," the paper went on to say, "is becoming a world centre of fighters for the freedom of Czechoslovakia.... Those who meet material difficulties and have insufficient means for activities in or outside Czechoslovakia are given material support....

"The Co-ordination Centre has prepared a programme for organising the publication of *Literarni Listy*, a paper which is the voice of democracy [?!] in Czechoslovakia. Contributions for this purpose may be sent to: Discount Bank, account No. 450055, Tel Aviv."

Thus, both on the eve of and during the events in Czechoslovakia, in its own interests and the interests of its imperialist allies, international Zionism created a number of centres specialising in different kinds of subversive activities against the socialist countries, and moved some of them (including the Committee for Czechoslovak Refugees) close to the frontiers of Czechoslovakia. Moreover, Zionist agents actually infiltrated the country. According to press reports, Israeli nationals were working as advisors at many of the illegal broadcasting stations that were set up in the country and slandered socialism and the socialist achievements of the Czechoslovak people.

International Zionism spared no efforts to support the plot of the American imperialists and West German revanchists against the Czechoslovak people, and thus against all the peoples of the socialist community. Nor can it be denied that the intrigues of international Zionism (in this case in Czechoslovakia) did in fact receive a certain amount of support within the country from some ideologically corrupt

and openly pro-Zionist elements among citizens of Jewish descent.

The so-called Czechoslovak "refugees" sent by the Zionists' Vienna espionage centre to Israel for instruction and further use as Zionist agents and spies in West European countries and Czechoslovakia, were written of in perfectly unambiguous terms by the Israeli newspaper *The Jerusalem Post.* "They have come for moral compensation for the Czech arms deliveries to the Arabs and the behaviour of the Communist bloc," the paper wrote. According to the same paper, one of these transferred elements declared: "I want to compensate a little at least for my country's delivering arms to the Arabs. These deliveries are a cause of suffering to me."

Who corrupted and inspired these "long-suffering martyrs", apart from the Zionists in the service of Voice of Israel, Voice of America, and other equally lying voices? Their names are known: Eduard Goldstücker, Jiři Pelikan, Ota Šik, A. Liehm and many other Zionist supporters, posing as "loyal" Czechoslovak patriots and showing the usual long-suffering patience and persistence with lying that enabled them to gain control of the means of mass information.

It is worth mentioning here that the value, or rather the price of the ideas Goldstücker and his brethren introduced into Czechoslovak society with the aim of rallying the forces of internal counter-revolution is testified by a simple, but nevertheless significant fact that came to light recently. For a long time in the past Goldstücker had been receiving inflated fees for his foreign publications from Fritz Molden, the "king" of the Austrian bourgeois press, then Allen Dulles's son-in-law.

It was in fact no accident that in the circumstances of continuing Israeli aggression and militarist fascist terror in the occupied Arab territories, when the Zionist expansionists were openly flouting all the decisions and demands of the UN, the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia were calling for the immediate restoration of diplomatic and commercial relations with Israel.

Christmas Eve, 1969. Paris was gaily decorated with Christmas trees and the streets were unusually deserted. The corridors of the French National Assembly were empty. Silence reigned in the residence of Baron Edmond de Roth-

schild (b. 1926).* The Pope was speaking on television. Paul VI lost his place, and patiently waited for a lay-brother to push the text of the address closer to his failing eyes and point to where he had gone astray.

The Parisians celebrated the festive season at home, *en famille*, and the vast majority were naturally unaware that their city was the scene of a meeting between the Czechoslovak Zionist counter-revolutionaries Ota Šik, Pelikan, Liehm and others, and representatives of the so-called "old emigration". On the agenda was: unification of the old and new emigration to form a Paris centre that would be the largest in Europe, and exploration of the possibility of publishing the newspaper *Literarni Listy* in Paris. The "new emigration" was prepared to finance the scheme. They had been promised the wherewithal by the Discount Bank in Tel Aviv, where the expenses would be deducted from Account No. 450055.

The Parisians were celebrating Christmas and many of them had not yet got round to thinking about how much of the money earned by their labour had been transferred by Rothschild, Pierre Dreyfus and other financiers and businessmen as little concerned for the interests of France to that same account No. 450055. They did not know that on the mantle of Paul VI, glittering on their TV screens, there lay the shadow of the Vatican Cardinal Augustin Bea, who had long ago abandoned his Jewish faith to embrace Catholicism in order to help cement the alliance between the Catholic Church and the Jewish Church by means of the Second

---

* The founder of the Rothschild dynasty of financial magnates was the banker Amschel Meyer of Frankfort-on-the Main (1743-1812). His descendents soon moved to Vienna (where they received the title of Baron), London, Naples and Paris. By the mid-19th century as a result of the financial dependence of several of the courts of Europe on the Rothschilds, the latter had a considerable influence in European politics. In the latter half of the 19th century and the early years of the present century the Rothschild bankers in Austria, England and France, closely connected with one another, played a major role in providing government loans in their respective countries. The Rothschilds played an important part in financing the intervention against the Soviet Republic (1918-1920), had a hand in the strengthening of the Hitlerite regime in Germany, the suppression of the national revolutionary struggle of the Spanish people (1936-1939) and preparations for the Second World War. The Rothschilds have always been a major financial pillar of Zionist organisations.

Vatican Council Declaration of November 20, 1964, and a cheque in favour of the Vatican, of whose origin even the old, trusted keepers of the banking secrets of the principality of Liechtenstein have no inkling.

At three o'clock in the early hours of Christmas morning, five fast rocket-launcher destroyers slipped quietly out of the French port of Cherbourg. They had been built by a French firm on an Israeli order. They slipped away, despite the strict orders of the French Government that they should not be handed over to the customer. It was a world-wide sensation. In a fever of excitement hundreds of leading newspapers and magazines throughout the capitalist world reported the thrilling news. Once more there was frank admiration of Israeli skill and the elusiveness of Zionist agents. Once more the heart of the matter was concealed and the chief culprits were shielded from the public eye by a torrent of detailed and tendentious information. And only a terse report published in the French Communist newspaper on March 3, 1970, gave a hint of what was really behind it all:

"Admiral Limon in Israel," *L'Humanité* wrote, "will wear the blue cloak with Brandenburg embroidery and the yellow cap of Baron Edmond de Rothschild. Limon's brilliant part in the Christmas affair of the Cherbourg destroyers has decided his appointment as manager of all the French financier's investments in Israel."

The French Government expelled the organiser of the "scandalous theft", Admiral Limon, Counsellor of the Israeli Embassy in Paris, and a few weeks later "the French financier" rewarded his willing tool, having flouted the French Government for the umpteenth time.

The French Rothschilds have had a hand in the ousting of numerous politicians and governments in France, a country so alien to their spirit. And they know how to keep their secrets, just as they managed to keep secret their rendez-vous during the two world wars, when they congregated from Austria, France and England to gloat together, *en famille*, over their champagne glasses at the peoples of Europe shedding their blood somewhere out there—it might be on another planet—to assign roles and spheres of influence and count their profits.

The Israeli historian and journalist Hannah Arendt was so right when she wrote: "Where, indeed, was there better proof

of the fantastic concept of a Jewish world government than in this one family, the Rothschilds, nationals of five different countries . . . in close co-operation with *at least* [my italics—*Y.I.*] three different governments . . . whose frequent conflicts never for a moment shook the solidarity of interests of their state bankers? No propaganda could have created a symbol more effective for political purposes than the reality itself."*

Indeed, who is it that moves the English Queen Elizabeth II to pay ceremonial visits to the synagogue, as the London *Jewish Chronicle* triumphantly reported in February 1970? If this question appears unimportant, there is every reason to get to the bottom of another question, which deserves careful attention and scrupulous investigation. Towards the end of May 1969, the Chairman of the West German National-Democratic Party (NDP) Adolf von Thadden—Führer of the West German neo-nazis—was interviewed by a correspondent of *Der Spiegel*. He was asked the following question:

"Herr von Thadden, you have recently been talking of the NDP having seats in the next Bundestag as if it were already an absolute certainty. If things don't go as well as expected at the September 28 Bundestag elections, is it not very possible that you will simply be forced to resign the Party chairmanship?"

Von Thadden's answer was, in part, as follows:

"I certainly would be in that case. But it won't come to that. An Israeli journalist has just informed me that he doesn't know a single politician here who is not absolutely convinced that the NDP will have seats in the next Bundestag."

Von Thadden was deliberately lying. He knew perfectly well that the right time for his party had not yet come, and was quite aware that come what may he would retain his leadership. This is precisely what happened.

At the 4th Congress of the NDP, held on February 9, 1970, von Thadden was re-elected Chairman despite the modest results his party achieved in the Bundestag elections, the NDP receiving a mere 4.3 per cent of the votes. But why was it that von Thadden had suddenly felt bound to add to all his

---

* Quoted from H. M. Sachar, *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, p. 129.

other propaganda bluster the opinion of an Israeli journalist, real or fictitious? It was hardly calculated to win over an extra thousand potential but still wavering supporters, whose anti-Semitism is taken for granted. No, far more serious matters were involved.

"Where does the NDP find the resources it needs, which are growing at a fantastic rate from year to year?" Charles Haroche asked himself and his readers in an article entitled "Le néo-nazisme: attention danger!" (*France Nouvelle*, September 3, 1969). He pointed out, quite correctly, that membership dues could only cover an insignificant part of the neo-nazis' expenses. "In 1965," he continues, "NDP membership dues amounted to DM 78, 472.67, in 1966 to DM 176,570.11, and in the first few months of 1967 were as much as 169,071.72." Haroche then plunges into guesswork and quotes material that can be found on any newsstand in West Germany. In answer to the authors of such quotations, Ernst Henry wrote in his article "Who Pays the Neo-Nazis?" (*Pravda*, August 10, 1968): "The bourgeois press in the FRG makes out that only a few second-rank industrialists have begun to give some support to the NDP. They name, for example, the Bavarian manufacturer of tank caterpillars Diel, a friend of Strauss; Etker, the owner of shipping lines and food factories, and Schickedanz, owner of a Bavarian mail-order firm. These businessmen are indeed collaborating more or less openly with the NDP. Their fortunes run into the tens, if not the hundreds of millions of DM, and they have a considerable influence in Bonn society and the Bonn state. Yet it is not they who hold the reins of power in the camp of West German monopoly capital."

This sums up the situation very accurately. Let us return, however, to Charles Haroche's article. Haroche mentions the fact that Bauer, Attorney-General of Bavaria, revealed yet another source of the NDP's funds revenue when he informed a correspondent of the British newspaper *The People* that the NDP received money from various funds that the nazis had sent out of Hitler Germany for safe keeping in foreign banks and also from the sale of various treasures plundered by the nazis.

Bauer went on to say that in the last three years (1967-1969) certain unknown brokers had sold large batches of valuable metals and jewels on the Stock Exchanges of Geneva and Amsterdam. Inquiries revealed that these

represented a part of the treasures concealed by the nazis, and that the money from the sale went into the NDP kitty.

If the inquiries Bauer refers to had been carried out thoroughly—and there can be no doubt that they were—the very mention of the Amsterdam Stock Exchange was extremely significant. For this has long been the preserve of the Rothschilds, who are kept well informed by their agents of everything that goes on there down to the last detail. Not a single big deal is concluded in Amsterdam without the knowledge of the multimillionaire Zionist family.

There is another line of approach to the investigation of a fact that is becoming plainer and plainer all the time, and that is that Israeli militarism and West German neo-nazism are fed from the same source. The old family of bankers, Leopold Seligman of Cologne, has long-standing ties with the Rothschilds. The original Seligmans (three brothers—Mauritz, Jakob and Heinrich) founded their business in 1811 in Koblenz, and transferred it to Cologne in 1868. For a long time relations between the two families were via the Rothschilds' Austrian branch. However, the simple fact of these dealings would not mean very much, were it not for two other extremely significant points.

The following is an extract from a short, but most enlightening article by the Soviet scholar Y. Yevseyev. "Voluntary contributions to Israel's Treasury have often been made by West German monopolies and trusts in one way or another connected with the Zionist 'Millionaires' International'. Among the most important of these are: Deutsche Bank headed by Hermann Abs (the late Adenauer was on the supervisory board), Berliner Bank, Frankfurter Bank, Bayerische Hypotheken- und Wechsel-Bank, the old banking house of Leopold Seligman in Cologne—the citadel of the Rhine banks, Salomon Oppenheim Jr. and Co., and J. H. Stein, also based in Cologne. . . ."* Let us compare this honest report with a report issued by the ADN Agency in Berlin in early August 1968, which declared that "a group of representatives of the Flick, Rudolf, Etker, BASF concerns and several other of the leading FRG monopolies held secret discussions at the end of last week with the leaders of the

* *Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn* No. 10, 1969, p. 43.

NDP. At the meeting, the place of which was kept secret, the candidates the NDP proposed putting up for the 1969 Bundestag elections were discussed".

We should note especially the presence at the meeting of representatives of major Rhenish banks, the Leopold Seligman Bank of Cologne being one of them and having close ties with them, as well as having long-standing business connections with the Rothschilds and being a generous benefactor of the Armed Forces of the State of Israel.

Thus, it is quite clear that the NDP and Israeli militarism are fed by the same hand. Is this paradoxical? All those who are fond of speaking of "paradoxes", especially in connection with the international Zionist movement today, might do well to answer the following question: why is it that the capital of the Rothschild family, and a Jewish family mark, feeding as parasites on the economy of many countries, should have emerged not only unscathed but even healthier than ever from the years when the nazis were brutally murdering numerous peoples in Europe, the Jews among them? We have already seen how the Jews in Europe were doomed in advance to the role of victims by the Zionist fanatics, nursed from the cradle by the Rothschilds, how the Zionists came to terms with the nazis with whom they collaborated in driving the Jews either into the concentration camp crematoria or the kibbutzes of the "Land of Canaan". The German journalist Heinz Höhne hit the nail squarely on the head when he wrote that "since the Zionists and the National Socialists had elevated race and nation to the scale of all things, it was inevitable that a common bridge should have appeared between them".

As Lenin pointed out: "Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and of monopolies, which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom." In implementing this aim, imperialism has always counted, and continues to count, on the reactionary forces which it considers to best serve its interests in the particular historical circumstances obtaining at a given stage. Hence the way it once backed fascism so heavily.

The Rothschild bankers were among the monopoly capital groups that backed fascism in the struggle against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In opposing freedom and its major bearer, the world's first state of workers and peasants, for the umpteenth time, international imperialism suffered a

crushing defeat in 1945. However, in the new situation that ensued—the emergence of a community of socialist countries and a rapid upswing and new triumphs of the working-class, communist and national liberation movements, imperialism began to search for new ways and means of defending its positions, new detachments of reactionary fanatics to be its willing tools, new means of recapturing lost ground. Neo-colonialism, attempts to create "ultra-imperialism" in miniature, relying on the network of international Jewish capital, the boosting of the economic might of the FRG and the emergence of neo-nazism, the all-round consolidation of international Zionism as an instrument of imperialist reaction, attempts to establish contacts with nationalism of every form and shade and the pétards of new ideological subversion—all this testifies to the intensive work and efforts of international reaction, which, although on the retreat, is nevertheless still extremely active and highly dangerous.

The period of the rise of fascism was also the period of the all-round consolidation of Zionism. Zionism survived and established itself not in spite of fascism, but thanks to fascism, which in the new historical conditions (history never repeats itself exactly) it is rapidly moving in to replace. Every example of nationalism based on concepts of racial superiority carries within it the embryo of fascism. The intensity of active nationalism differs according to conditions and circumstances; but the imperialist arsenal contains means of stimulating it to the maximum.

Let us consider the following lines: "Where the roads from the west cut across the roads from the east, there lies the city of Jerusalem, the fortress of Zion. And the Jews, when they acknowledge the God of Israel, the One who is omnipotent, Jehovah, at sunrise and at sunset, stand with their feet together and their faces towards Jerusalem, towards Zion; *those in the west turn to the east, and those in the Orient turn to the west, all at the same hour, all facing towards Jerusalem....* With the sure intuition which they had for the new, for the dawn, they surmised the changing aspect of the world outside, the ousting of birth and worth by money....

"They knew that to exercise power and to endure power is not the real, the important thing. The colossi of force, did they not all go to rack and ruin one after the other? But they, the powerless, had set their seal on the world....

"...This mysterious knowledge it was that united the Jews and smelted them together, nothing else. For this mysterious knowledge was the meaning of the Book.

"If ... they were one, more one *than all the other peoples of the world*, it was the Book that sweated them into unity. Brown, white, black, yellow Jews, large and small, splendid and in rags, godless and pious, they might crouch and dream all their lives in a quiet room, or fare splendidly in a radiant, golden whirlwind over the earth, but sunk deep in all of them was the lesson of the Book....

"...They had dragged the Book with them through two thousand years.... They had given it to all peoples, and all peoples had embraced it. *But it is only legitimate possessors, knowers and judges, were they alone*" (all italics mine—*Y. I.*).

Lion Feuchtwanger could hardly have imagined that these passages of his famous book *Jew Süss* would one day be taken so seriously, that they would serve to inspire a man like Uri Zvie Greenberg, the bard of Israeli aggression, fascist poet Number One in Israel today.

On October 23, 1968, the Israeli newspaper *Haarets* published a "masterpiece" of a poem by Greenberg, entitled "On Place and Time", in which "the Israeli knight of nationalism", as he is referred to in the press, cynically extols war and scorns peace, mocks the idea of the equality of all nations, and glorifies the Jewry. He compares the dirty aggression of the Israeli invaders to the war of the Israelite leader Joshua whose "exploits" are extolled in the Bible, who also brutally massacred the indigenous inhabitants of the lands now trampled by the boots of Israeli shock units. He heaps violent abuse on all supporters of peace, and especially those Israeli citizens who have protested against the aggression. He insists that to return the seized Arab territories would mean the end of Israel, and labels as traitors all those who even think of it. The poem ends on the eloquent note: "My Israel, we need a leader with an iron hand!"

In reading these venomous lines one cannot help thinking of the tremendous responsibility that rests on the shoulders of all those who work at the sources of the written word, in the cinema, at the theatre, on the radio and television. How important it is that honest people should stand at the controls of the means that influence the opinions of the general public. The mass media must be vigilantly guarded by all to whom

the cause of socialism and progress are dear.* Time moves much faster in this complicated century of ours. The first works by Zionist writers came many decades before the literary ravings of Goldstücker, whereas only a month separated the "2,000 words" written in Czechoslovakia to dictation by qualified consultants from Greenberg's appeal for undisguised fascism in Israel, the lair of Zionism.

Lenin bade us safeguard the purity of communist ideology, and the noble Party spirit of Soviet literature, dictated by motives of highest humanism. He taught us to preserve the best and richest traditions of people's art and fulfil our international duty, standing firm on the ground of Soviet patriotism. And it is just because our Party and people carry Lenin's banner high through the storms of war and the difficulties of exploration, rallying around them all peace-loving countries and peoples, that international reaction continues to frantically mount subversive actions against the USSR, throwing its very last reserves into the field.

International Zionism belongs to these last reserves of imperialism. On March 11, 1970, giving its orders from above through the mouth of the Israeli Premier Golda Meir, it declared a total campaign against this country. The form in which this struggle is waged, already well known from the recent events in Czechoslovakia, is what is called "peaceful counter-revolution". The form of organisation of the struggle is also known—it is to attempt by exploiting sentiments surviving from the past, relics of the private ownership psychology and exerting ideological influence on the "autonomous individual" to create the conditions for the existence of various groups of like-minded persons, capable of combined action thanks to modern means of communication.

Voice of Israel broadcasts have a wide range of ideological content. Apart from sabotage and direct subversion, the Soviet Union's enemies would like to see, for example, "more sex in Russian classical ballet", "broadway style musicals" in Soviet theatres and so on.

Voice of Israel broadcasts to the Soviet Union in three languages. The Russian language broadcasts strike a rather whining note, and are not even particularly critical of the Soviet Union. The broadcasts in Yiddish preach Zionism and

---

* Imperialist propaganda cunningly tries to contrast these two concepts. We shall discuss this further on.

pour slander on the USSR; while the broadcasts in Hebrew give instructions.

But the Zionist efforts and all-out campaigns are doomed to failure. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has overcome more serious adversaries than these. Our comrades-in-arms, the Soviet Jewish working people reply to the provocational appeals from Tel Aviv and slanderous fabrications of the so-called "Jewish question in the USSR" with anger, indignation and mass protests.

International Zionism is the enemy of all peoples, nations and national groups. It has long since ceased to be a local phenomenon. Having concentrated in its hands tremendous financial resources, using the State of Israel as its base, and supported by the millionaires of the USA, Britain, France, West Germany, South Africa, Italy, Argentina and several other countries, it wages a day-by-day struggle against communism everywhere. Thus, the struggle against international Zionism is the vital concern of all Communists, all freedom-loving people throughout the world, all working people who detest exploitation and war.

Relying on the theory of Jewish "racial superiority", Zionism, both in word (suffice it to remember Greenberg) and deed, is following in the footsteps of fascism. It has made its base, Israel, a dungeon for all who refuse to comply with its monstrous, inhuman theories and practice or are simply deemed "undesirable".

Haifa is a beautiful city, rising in curved tiers from the turquoise waters of its bay up a green hill, topped by the golden dome of a church, built goodness knows how by natives of Persia. Higher up still, behind a mountain ridge, stands the Damoun prison. On March 7, 1969, a Jordanian intellectual named Jizhak Ali al-Morari was arrested in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem on the false charge of engaging in "hostile activities". He was swiftly transferred to Haifa and imprisoned in the Damoun. No one heard anything about him for a whole month. When his lawyers requested permission to see him, the Israeli reply was a curt refusal on the grounds that "inquiries were still proceeding". These "inquiries", as it later emerged, were conducted by the Israeli police commissar Marcus.... Al-Morari was strung up by his legs and given numerous electric shocks. Whenever he lost consciousness, Marcus ordered boiling and ice-cold water

to be poured over him alternately. For 21 days he was submitted to brutal beatings with clubs and whips causing a severe head-wound. He was on a starvation diet and was given filthy dishwater to drink. There was naturally no question of his receiving medical aid. As the successively more brutal torments were applied, Marcus repeated: "If you won't talk we shall have to continue." Al-Morari left the Damoun prison a cripple. He was released as innocent, since there was absolutely no evidence to the contrary. Al-Morari told reporters of his experiences in jail, but neither *The New York Times*, nor *The New York Herald Tribune*, nor the London *Jewish Chronicle*, nor any other Zionist or pro-Zionist newspaper—of which there are hundreds in the world—would publish his story. Al-Morari's story was only brought to the attention of the world by the militant press organ of the Israeli Communists—*Zo Hadereh**.

Abdallah Yussuf Oduan, a Communist, has been in the Til Karem prison of the Israeli militarists since March 29, 1969. His lawyers, Felicia Langer and Ali Rafa were not permitted to see him until September 8. When at last they did see him, the reason became plain enough. "They forced me to swallow lighted matches. They burnt my lips, and then I was forced to swallow them," Comrade Oduan told his lawyers. He had been beaten and tortured until he passed out. He had had his skin burnt and been given electric "treatment".

Are these but isolated, chance acts of brutality by sadists? Or are they the fruits of purposeful mass education? We have already had occasion to give an unambiguous answer to these questions. But here are some new, extremely significant facts:

On January 8, 1970, a Reuter correspondent reported from Tel Aviv: "The results of a public opinion poll held by an Israeli scientific research institute have just been published here. According to this poll, over 40 per cent of Israelis are for the immediate annexation by Israel of the Arab territories occupied during the Six Day War, 44.4 per cent are for maintaining the status quo for the time being, but 86.4 per cent are for mass Israeli settlement of the occupied lands."

A criminal end gives rise to criminal means.

On February 9, 1970, the London *Daily Mail* reported that a new, more effective model of the Uzzi submachine-gun

---

* September 24, 1969.

had been produced in Israel, following improvements by its inventor, Major Uzzi Gal. This new Israeli automatic rifle can be produced in two types, one of the standard NATO calibre, the other of small-bore rifle which uses tin-head bullets. The tin-head bullet, being soft, spreads out on impact and produces gaping wounds. The aim is to put five enemy soldiers out of action: according to the theory that it takes four men to aid one wounded soldier. It is already being delivered to front-line forces to replace the Belgian FN rifle.

In the years of fascist persecution of the Jews, to the inquiry of the British Royal Commission on the possibility of transferring six million West European Jews to Palestine, the Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann answered in the following cold-blooded manner: "No, the old will go.... They are dust, economic and moral dust of the world.... Only the branch will remain." Such is the symbolism of murderers. The idea was as clear as it was monstrous. "Let them kill and burn, we in return for saving lives shall send to Israel only the young and well-to-do and will educate them to make the Israel we need."

Thirty years later, on February 17, 1970, another Weizmann, the Israeli Minister of Communications Ezer Weizmann (b. 1924) made an equally cannibalistic statement in less symbolic, more prosaic terms. "The Israeli Army is ready to take any necessary steps the Government decides on.... Ancient Israel is in our hands. Any talks with the Arabs must concentrate on the rights of Israel and not on territorial concessions. I'd rather have a million Arabs in the bag than behind my back."

The Zionist leaders' consistency in their views and brutality is perfectly understandable. But many people who know little or nothing of the machinery of international Zionism find the following rather puzzling: how is it that 86.4 per cent of Israelis are for the fascist slogan of "Lebensraum", how is it that the former inmates of Oświęcim and Dachau can look on calmly while their sons take sadistic delight in burning people's skin and torturing them with electric current, destroy homes and kill the inhabitants of Arab towns? To many it seems impossible that among these 86.4 per cent of the citizens of the State of Israel there could be people with nazi prison camp numbers tattoed on their bodies. And yet there are!

How much is it necessary to cultivate the seed of a

nationalist or religious mystique originally planted in the mind of an intellectual by tendentious works of art and literature, for example, for him to howl, "Hail Dayan, the newly appeared Joshua!"? Does the imperialist arsenal contain means capable of producing this kind of effect? Practice shows that it does indeed.

The following is a list of just some of the Zionist organisations which, like the Main Documentary Centre in Vienna, were directly involved in influencing the Jews in Czechoslovakia prior to and during the events there.

1. The World Zionist Organisation.
2. The World Jewish Congress.
3. The Zionist Youth Organisation.
4. The Congress of European Zionists.
5. The Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organisations.
6. The International Council of Jewish Women.
7. The World Sephardi (Jews of non-European origin) Federation.
8. The Women's International Zionist Organisation.
9. The World-Wide Organisation for Child Care, Health and Hygiene among Jews.
10. The International Council on Jewish Social and Welfare Services.
11. The World Council of Jewish Workers.
12. The World Union of Jewish Students.
13. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency.
14. The World Organisation of Orthodox Jews.
15. The World Association of Jewish Artisans.
16. The World Federation of Young Speakers of Ancient Hebrew.
17. The International Consultative Committee of Organisations for Christian-Jewish Co-operation.
18. The World Congress of Jewish Journalists.

This list speaks for itself and in our opinion comment is superfluous, except, perhaps, to add that if Jews living outside the capitalist world are subject only to psychological and ideological treatment, those living in some capitalist countries, and especially Israel, are dependent for their daily welfare and sometimes even their lives on the Zionists.

This only serves to increase our respect for the heroic Communist Party of Israel and strengthen the solidarity of Communists of all countries with the struggle of the Israeli Communists, Jews and Arabs, defending hand in hand, in

the most difficult circumstances, the principles of internationalism. On February 16, 1970, the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel "warned the working people of Israel, the women and young people, of the tremendous danger of the escalation of aggression being carried out by the Israeli Government, and which threatens the very future existence of the country.... Israeli extremist ruling circles, following their own aims of territorial expansion, are acting hand in hand with US imperialism in its global plans, attempting to undermine the anti-imperialist national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, to overthrow the anti-imperialist governments in the Arab countries and sever the ties of friendship between these countries and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. By this policy the Israeli leaders are trying to torpedo all the efforts of the Soviet Union and other states to ensure a peaceful solution of the Middle East crisis on the basis of the UN Security Council Resolution of November 1967".

Only true patriots like the Communists speak out like that in Israel today. No threats, persecution, and attempts at extermination can force these courageous people to keep silent.

On December 16, 1969, the Secretary of the Tyre organisation of the Communist Party of Israel, Comrade Gazi Shbeyita, elected municipal representative by the people of Tyre was returning home. He never got there. His killers had been bought off a long time before. "Shinbet" is extremely generous when it comes to dealing with Communists. It is a matter of supreme indifference to the Israeli Secret Police as to whether the victim is one of the chosen people or not. The blow was delivered from behind, with a wooden club with iron spikes.

Shatta is an Israeli prison for compulsive murderers, recidivists and political prisoners. Two years ago, a Communist, Comrade Naim Al-Ashhab was brought here. No inquiry or court proceedings were held, and there was no indication that they were intended. On January 7, 1970, a hired murderer dealt him a heavy blow on the head with an iron tray causing a serious wound.

The prisoner, who is still in confinement, was saved by the solidarity of the other political prisoners, Arab and Jewish. They went on a hunger strike, announcing that they would end it only on condition that they were able to see Naim Al-Ashhab taking a daily walk.

Amid howls of protest from the Zionists, the question of saving the life of political prisoners, and especially the Jordanian Communist, Comrade Al-Ashhab, was brought up for discussion in the Knesset by the Communist members. On March 10, 1970, Naim Al-Ashhab sent a letter via friends to the International Red Cross Organisation.

How many such letters have been sent from Israel? How many more have not got past the frontiers of this "democratic" state? How many never reached their destination? But every one of them is waiting for an answer!

. . .I have a book on my desk. It reads from back to front. Inside is a photograph of a man whose brow and expression are deeply thoughtful. The written dedication ends with the words: "From Alexander Penn, who writes from right to left, Moscow, 24.8. 1964." The father of Israeli proletarian poetry, friend of Mayakovsky, one of the best translators of Soviet poetry into Hebrew, seems to be standing right here beside me again, leaning on his dark cane walking stick and reciting Vladimir Mayakovsky:

It's peace we demand.
But should anyone touch us,
we'll fall into ranks
and clench hard our teeth.
The war instigators
will face a rebellious,
all-workingmen's front,
with weapons unsheathed.

Although confined to his bed by a severe illness, Penn is still in the international ranks of the fighters for peace, against Israeli aggression.

He named his eldest daughter Senilga, because apart from Mayakovsky he is extremely fond of Shishkov.* The Rabbis were at a loss. But that was before the days when the racists began dictating their will to the local Rabbis, and the latter were satisfied that Senilga was a perfectly respectable name, even a good Jewish name.

Times change however.

---

* Senilga, a character in the novel *Ugrum River* by Soviet writer B. Y. Shishkov.

On January 24, 1970, Associated Press reported from Jerusalem that "the Israeli Knesset (Parliament) is likely to introduce legislation which could overturn the Supreme Court ruling that a child of a Jewish father and a non-Jewish mother is still a Jew".

The Israeli Minister of Justice, Ja'acov Shapiro, announced on January 25, 1970, that he would submit a recommendation immediately to revoke the ruling of the Supreme Court. However, Victor Shemtov, Minister Without Portfolio (and an Israeli Intelligence chief—*Y. I.*) welcomed the Supreme Court ruling "as encouraging the immigration of Jews to Israel, including those of mixed marriages". The ruling passed by five votes to four in the Supreme Court provoked a storm of protest and controversy in international Zionist circles. We borrow from Associated Press the following short account of the incident that has produced such heated debate over this matter of great importance to the Jewish racists.

"The argument arose after the Supreme Court supported the Navy Lt. Cmdr., Benyamin Shalit's demand that his children must be registered as of Jewish 'Peoplehood', even though their mother is an atheist. According to the court ruling, the children must be registered as of Jewish nationhood and as having no religion. In effect, the Supreme Court took the right to determine a person's religion out of the hands of the state rabbinate. [Note how the correspondent side-tracks the issue here, thereby revealing his own view.—*Y. I.*]

"The Rabbis countered by warning this would split the Jewish people, and accused the court of trying to separate the church from the state."

On January 27, 1970, France Press reported from Jerusalem that "on Tuesday evening the Grand Rabbinate forbade the registering of children born of mixed marriages, and declared that no authority on earth could violate the law according to which only persons born of a Jewish mother or who had changed their faith could be counted as Jews". (According to the laws of the Jewish religion a person is a Jew if his mother is Jewish or if he has embraced the Jewish faith, observing the necessary ceremonies.)

On January 29, 1970, Reuter reported: "The Israeli Cabinet is meeting today in a special session to prevent a political crisis over the question of 'who to count as Jewish'. The Minister of Justice Mr. Shapiro proposed a compromise decision, the introduction of two ammendments to the law:

the law of return, giving all the rights of Israeli citizenship to Jewish immigrants, would apply to children even if their mother was not Jewish. After which, any who later wanted to be considered Jews should embrace the Jewish faith."

Finally, on March 10, 1970, *Pravda* reported: "The Israeli parliament has passed a law whereby only those born of a Jewish mother and embracing the Jewish faith are to be considered as holding Jewish nationality."

What lies behind this protracted and deliberately confused uproar? Is it but another example of the open racism of the Zionists and the "fathers" of the Jewish religion? Is it another proof of the obscurantism and fascist tendencies of the Israeli ministers? Partly yes, but the heart of the matter lies elsewhere. The arch-reactionary nature of the Jewish faith has long been no secret—one has only to open the Bible for one's eyes to fall on numerous racist sentences. Even less of a secret is the racism of the Zionist leaders, for after all that was what they started from.

What is the relationship between the fate of the children of an officer of the Israeli Navy who married a Scottish woman, and the existence in Japan of a sect founded by the Zionists, which views all the Japanese as the descendents of "the Lost Tribe of Israel"? Strange as it may seem, there is a connection, and quite a close one at that. The recent squabble in Jerusalem was but a clash between two camps in Israeli ruling circles, two camps that are by no means antagonistic to each other, but simply hold different views for the time being on *the best way to get manpower in the present circumstances.*

A fairly well-known British politician cynically declared recently: "Just as every Englishman is ready to fight to the last Frenchman, so every European and American Jew is prepared to fight to the last Israeli." Similarly, we have 86.4 per cent of Israeli citizens in favour of settling the seized Arab territories—*with Jewish immigrants.*

The Israeli leaders need more cannon fodder and "live material" for the Israelisation of the occupied lands. With a view to this some of the Israeli Zionist leaders are prepared to reject those dogmas of the Jewish religion which once helped them gain control (via the synagogue) of large numbers of credulous people. Another, more cautious group of the Israeli ruling clique consider this premature, and still count on "influencing" the numerous believers "on the

perifery" (i.e., outside Israel). Such was the true essence of the violent controversy that raged in the Israeli parliament.

It was perfectly natural that the afore-mentioned Benyamin Shalit should have been so keen for the Israeli authorities to accord his children Jewish nationality. To be a gentile in Israel is to be deprived of rights. Still worse is the fate of the Arabs, whom the Israeli racists put in a special category, still lower than the Goys, the gentiles in general. In Israel, and especially in the occupied territories, the Zionists have unleashed open terror against the Arab population. This terror takes various forms, but all of them are reminiscent of the methods employed by the nazis during the Second World War. The civilian population of Arab towns and villages where the Israeli occupiers are in charge are under constant threat of expulsion, arrest or physical liquidation. As *The Guardian* aptly remarked on March 4, 1970, the bulldozer has indeed become the symbol of the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem. The Zionists have turned the symbol of constructive labour into a symbol of destruction—the destruction of hundreds of homes. From 1967 to June 1969, 6,728 houses had been destroyed or requisitioned in the occupied territories, 5,000 people killed, and 16,000 injured, thrown into prison or "missing"—vanished without trace.

The Israeli authorities try to conceal brutalities, which are carried out with their sanction. Information on the crimes of the Israeli military has to get by a double barrier—Israeli military censorship and the censorship of international Zionism outside Israel. This must be borne in mind by anyone wishing to make a realistic estimate of the scale and degree of the brutal persecution of the Arabs by the Israeli militarists. Early in 1969, the Iraqi Minister of Foreign Affairs Abdul Karim al Sheikli sent a letter to the United Nations Secretary General U Thant, informing him of one of the latest crimes of the Israeli racists, the burying alive of 14 Arab prisoners-of-war.

The destruction of Arab villages, shooting on peaceful demonstrations of women and children, torture in interrogation, the widespread use of paid hirelings to organise the "elimination" of people refusing to serve the Zionist interests, and other equally heinous criminal acts, are on the conscience of those like Golda Meir, who is able to put to her listeners the rhetorical question: "Why when a house is destroyed do people start raising cries of barbarism?"!

In sowing fascist methods in Israel, carefully cultivating racism there, and oppressing hundreds of thousands of Arabs, international Zionism—a tool and agent of imperialism—often dons all kinds of garb to appeal to small peoples and national groups on the grounds of "common interests". Sometimes, as is the case in Africa, for example, ignorance of the true nature of Zionism enables it to carry out the most base acts of provocation, on orders from London and Washington.

Thus, a *Washington Post* correspondent, Robert Estabrook, admitted that the Israeli authorities sent the Biafran troops at least two planeloads of captured Soviet arms and equipment, as a psychological warfare manoeuvre designed to provoke the distrust of the Nigerian Federal Government and "thereby to discredit Moscow".

Wherever it possibly can, international Zionism (by no means always acting under the Israeli flag) tries to undermine the prestige of the socialist countries, and organise both petty acts of provocation and major ideological subversion against them.

In all kinds of circumstances—from various angles, in various versions, and decked out in various kinds of tinsel camouflage—the imperialist West, making use of the services of its agents, including the Zionists, tries to sell the population of the socialist world the idea that in the age of space flight, nuclear power, world-wide TV communications, and other modern means of communication there is a fundamental "contradiction" between socialist patriotism and support of progress. This false "contradiction" invented years ago can be resolved (naturally!) by renunciation of the class struggle and acceptance of the "advantages" of private ownership of the means of production, as illustrated by thousands of literary, cinema and TV "inventions", involving all sorts of anti-worlds, anti-people, anti-morality, and above all anti-communism. Bourgeois sociologists, philosophers and economists kindly offer to free us from this cunningly contrived "contradiction", presenting in a distorted, hypertrophied form various separate features inherent in modern capitalism on the retreat. They are prepared to offer mankind integration, convergence, any form of "integrated industrial society" at all—barring communism, which much to their displeasure is marching forward triumphantly.

One of the originators of these false theories is the well-known American anti-Soviet expert Walt Rostow (born

1916, into the family of Victor Aaron Rostow, for a long time trusted expert in Zionist affairs at the White House). American imperialism still employs the services of this veteran organiser of anti-communist ideological attacks. But time marches on, and the old advisers in the White House are gradually being replaced by new ones, less averse to revealing their real convictions and intentions. On January 22, 1970, an official report from Washington stated that high-placed government officials were taking an active part in the Zionist organisations of the United States of America. According to the official bulletin of the National Committee of the Republican Party, four of the senior advisers to the President of the United States had been appointed to high posts in the "United Jewish Appeal" Zionist organisation in the capital, in order to help it in its campaign to raise funds. These included: Leonard Garment, head of the national (?) aims research group at the White House; William Safire, special assistant to the President on questions of internal planning; Herbert Stein, member of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, and Eugene Cowen, administrative assistant for liaison with Congress, who is Honorary Chairman of the "United Jewish Appeal". Events have thus come the full circle. US Government circles, according to the will of monopoly capital (the real representatives of which once more prefer to remain in the shadows), have publicly united with Zionist leaders, demonstrating to the whole world the direct relationship and interdependence that exists between them.

* * *

Nothing throws Zionism into greater confusion than the fixed attention of the world public. Nothing draws from it such a flow of accusations of anti-Semitic activity as the efforts to trace the path it has trodden from the beginning to the present day. This is no accident. There are numerous reasons why it should be so, the main one being that the attempts of the international Zionist concern to completely cover up the compromising tracks it has left in the distant and the recent past have been to no avail.

With this in mind Zionism has long been striving to appear before the eyes of world public opinion as an integral ideological, organisational and functional whole. Multi-

formity and pseudo-irrational diversity—such are the new and carefully selected dominoes of the contemporary Zionist masquerade. And only a thorough scrutiny and collation of events and facts enable us to ascertain the direct connections between seemingly unrelated phenomena (from military provocations and economic upheavals to petty sabotage "of angry young men") and see the old familiar faces behind the new masks. It is this attention calling for unceasing, calm vigilance that more than anything else upsets the leaders of the international Zionist concern accustomed to the long-established privilege of always remaining in the shadows.

The June aggression of the Israeli ruling class has brought out of the traditional shadows the silhouette of the Zionist leaders, the organisers of international provocations, crimes and sordid intrigues, who are capable of defying and disregarding everything in their drive for profit and power. Today they are scurrying back into the shadows.

But in vain. For everywhere there are people who do not doff their caps before the owners of bulging purses and extensive kennels and will not permit them to lurk in the shadows again, just as nations and history will not permit them to escape retribution.

August 1968

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PREFACE AND CHAPTER I

[1] Sneh, M. and Vilenska, E., *Crisis of Zionism*, Tel Aviv, 1961, p. 3 (retranslated from the Russian).

[2] *The Jerusalem Post* (weekly), August 14, 1967, p. 4 (retranslated from the Russian).

[3] Bentwich, N., *Palestine*, London, 1934, p. 60.

[4] Sachar, H. M., *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, N. Y., 1963, p. 265.

[5] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, London, Vol. I, p. XI.

[6] Brandeis, Justice L., *On Zionism*, N. Y., 1942, pp. 24-26 (quoted: Levenberg, S., *The Jews and Palestine*, London, 1945, p. 42).

[7] Scramuzza, V. and MacKendrick, P., *The Ancient World*, N. Y., 1958, p. 85.

[8] Ausubel, N., *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*, N. Y., 1964, p. 126.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Brentano, L., *Das Wirtschaftsleben der antiken Welt*, Jena, 1929, S. 80.

[11] Parkes, J., *End of an Exile*, London, 1954, p. 92.

[12] *Jeremiah*, 29—5, 6, 6.

[13] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. 106.

[14] Olmstead, A. T., *History of the Persian Empire*, Phoenix Books, Chicago, 1960, p. 57.

[15] Baron, Salo W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2nd ed., Vol. V, N. Y., 1957, p. 25.

[16] Ibid.

[17] *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. III, p. 407.

[18] Ibid., Vol. VI, 1927, pp. 137, 143.

[19] Ausubel, N., *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*, p. 127.

[20] Stein, L., *Zionism*, London, 1925, p. 13.

[21] Scramuzza, V. and MacKendrick, P., *The Ancient World*, p. 599.

[22] Ibid., p. 600.

[23] Roth, C., *History of the Jews*, N. Y., 1963, pp. 151-55.

[24] *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. VII, 1932, p. 644.

[25] Ausubel, N., *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*, p. 119.

[26] Olmstead, A. T., *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 481.

[27] *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. VI, p. 559.

[28] Roth, C., *History of the Jews*, p. 91.

[29] *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. III, p. 429.

[30] Ausubel, N., *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*, p. 127.

[31] Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 1, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1969, S. 374.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Roth, C., *History of the Jews*, p. 136.
[34] Ben Halpern, *The Idea of the Jewish State*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961, p. 105.
[35] *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. II, p. 156.
[36] Ibid., Vol. VII, p. 643.
[37] Ibid., Vol. VII, p. 650.
[38] Sachar, H. M., *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, p. 27.
[39] Ibid., p. 29.
[40] *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. VII, p. 648.
[41] БСЭ, т. 24, 1932, стр. 26.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Roth, C., *History of the Jews*, p. 267 et seq.
[44] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, p. 18.
[45] Baron, Salo W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Vol. V, p. 27.
[46] Ibid., p. 150.
[47] Stein, L., *Zionism*, p. 17.
[48] БСЭ, т. 24, 1932, стр. 62.
[49] Stein, L., *Zionism*, pp. 20-21.
[50] Sachar, H. M., *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, p. 27.
[51] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 100.
[52] Stein, L., *Zionism*, pp. 24-25.
[53] Lilienthal, A., *What Price Israel*, Chicago, 1953, p. 16.
[54] Ausubel, N., *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*, p. 234.
[55] Sachar, H. M., *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, p. 149.
[56] Ibid., p. 131.
[57] Ibid., p. 289.
[58] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 100-01.
[59] Daly, Charles P., *The Settlement of the Jews in North America*, N. Y., 1893 (quoted: Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, p. 57).
[60] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. 222.
[61] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 221.
[62] Ibid., Vol. I, p. 66.
[63] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 230.
[64] Ibid., Vol. I, p. 118.
[65] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 138.
[66] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 243.
[67] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 259.
[68] Edelman, M., *Political Biography of Ben-Gurion*, London, 1964, p. 55.
[69] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. 273.

[70] *Max Nordau to His People*, N. Y., 1941, p. 57.
[71] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. 371.
[72] Ibid., Vol. II, p. XLVII.

CHAPTER II

[1] *New Outlook*, Tel Aviv, January 1966, pp. 49-58.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 101.
[7] Ben Halpern, *The Idea of the Jewish State*, p. 6.
[8] Sachar, H. M., *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, p. 105 (retranslated from the Russian).
[9] Ben Halpern, *The Idea of the Jewish State*, p. 9.
[10] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 99-102.
[11] Levenberg, S., *The Jews and Palestine*, London, 1945, p. 134.
[12] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, Петроград, 1917, стр. 12.
[13] Simon, L., *Studies in Jewish Nationalism*, London, 1920, p. 31.
[14] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, С—Пб., 1896, стр. 66.
[15] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 79.
[16] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. LXI.
[17] Ahad Ha'am, *Nationalism and the Jewish Ethics*, N. Y., p. 77.
[18] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, p. 189.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Roth, C., *History of the Jews*.
[21] *Max Nordau to His People*, p. 163.
[22] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 99-100.
[23] Stein, L., *Zionism*, p. 77.
[24] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, стр. 22.
[25] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, стр. 12, 13.
[26] Dark, S., *The Jew To-day*, London, 1933, pp. 25-26.
[27] *The Jewish Agency for Palestine*, Jerusalem, 1947, p. 7.
[28] Crossman, R., *A Nation Reborn*, London, 1959, p. 21.
[29] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 333-34.
[30] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, стр. 71.
[31] Stein, L., *Zionism*, p. 75.
[32] *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, translated and edited by M. Lewenthal, N. Y., pp. 6, 10.
[33] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, стр. 16.
[34] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, p. 189.
[35] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 100.

[36] *Max Nordau to His People*, p. 73.
[37] Ibid., p. 92.
[38] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, стр. 10.
[39] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, pp. XXI, 193.
[40] Weizmann, Ch., *Trial and Error*, London, 1949, p. 196.
[41] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, стр. 33.
[42] Simon, L., *Studies in Jewish Nationalism*, p. 43.
[43] *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, p. 26.
[44] Герцль, Т., *Сочинения*, т. I, Петроград, 1918, стр. 164.
[45] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, стр. 33.
[46] Ahad Ha'am, *Nationalism and the Jewish Ethics*, pp. 78, 79.
[47] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, pp. XX, XXI.
[48] *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, p. 100.
[49] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, стр. 29.
[50] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, стр. 31.
[51] Герцль, Т., *Полное собрание речей и статей о сионизме*, Белосток, 1905, стр. 257.
[52] Weizmann, Ch., *Trial and Error*, p. 14.
[53] Sneh, M., *Conclusion on the National Question in the Light of Marxism-Leninism*, Tel Aviv, 1954, p. 98.
[54] Weizmann, Ch., *Trial and Error*, p. 184.
[55] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 537.
[56] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. XLII.
[57] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, стр. 47.
[58] Пинскер, Л., *Автоэмансипация*, стр. 40, 33, 36.
[59] Ahad Ha'am, *Nationalism and the Jewish Ethics*, pp. 76-77 (retranslated from the Russian).
[60] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. I, pp. XXIV-XXV.
[61] *Max Nordau to His People*, p. 24.
[62] Levenberg, S., *The Jews and Palestine*, p. 138.
[63] Sachar, H. M., *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, p. 288.
[64] Edelman, M., *A Political Biography of Ben-Gurion*, p. 32 (retranslated from the Russian).
[65] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, pp. 364-65.
[66] Ibid., p. 366.
[67] Ibid., p. 365.
[68] Ibid., p. 366.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Levenberg, S., *The Jews and Palestine*, p. 11.
[71] Ibid., p. 17.
[72] Ibid., p. 55.
[73] Герцль, Т., *Еврейское государство*, стр. 25, 26.
[74] БСЭ, т. 24, 1932, стр. 107.
[75] Ibid.

[76] *The Communist International. 1919-1943, Documents*, Vol. I, London, 1956, p. 366.

[77] БСЭ, т. 24, 1932, стр. 105.

[78] Жаботинский, Вл., *Бунд и сионизм*, Одесса, 1906, стр. 48.

[79] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 495.

CHAPTER III

[1] Центральный государственный архив Октябрьской революции, фонды.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] ЦГАОР, ДП, ОО, д. 11, ч. 2, литер «Б», 1898.

[6] Crossman, R., *A Nation Reborn*, p. 55.

[7] ЦГАОР СССР, фонды.

[8] Паттерсон, Дж. Г., *С еврейским отрядом в Галлиполи*. Под редакцией и с предисловием К. И. Чуковского. Петербург, 1917, стр. 5.

[9] ЦГАОР, ДП, ОО, д. 44, 1914, л. 83.

[10] Ibid., л. 170.

[11] ЦГАОР, ф. 5325, оп. 57, ед. хр. 607.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Crossman, R., *A Nation Reborn*, pp. 62-63.

[14] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, p. 55.

[15] Levenberg, S., *The Jews and Palestine*, p. 190.

[16] Sokolow, N., *History of Zionism*, Vol. II, pp. 89, 92.

[17] Hurewitz, G., *The Struggle for Palestine*, N. Y., 1950, p. 27.

[18] Ahad Ha'am, *Nationalism and the Jewish Ethics*, pp. 24-25.

[19] Balfour, A. J., *Speeches on Zionism*, London, 1928, p. 26.

[20] *The Palestine Royal Commission Report* (CMD, 5479), 1937, p. 84.

[21] Melchett, H. L. M., *Thy Neighbour*, N. Y., 1937, p. 252.

[22] Crossman, R., *A Nation Reborn*, p. 61.

[23] Sidebotham, H., *British Imperial Interest in Palestine*, Garden City Press Ltd., 1957, pp. 11-12.

[24] Hurewitz, G., *The Struggle for Palestine*, pp. 27, 28.

[25] *Max Nordau to His People*, p. 57.

[26] Jabotinsky, V., *An Answer to Ernest Bevin*, N. Y., 1946, pp. 10, 12, 16.

[27] *Palestine and the Middle East*, Vol. XVIII, Nos. 7-8, July-August 1941.

[28] *Der Spiegel*, 19. XII. 1966.

[29] Sneh, M., *Conclusion on the National Question...*, Tel Aviv, 1954. (Chapter: "Zionism—the Instrument of Jewish Imperial Bourgeoisie and Imperialism".)

[30] Ibid.

[31] *Der Spiegel*, 19. XII. 1966.
[32] Cohen, M., *The Faith of a Liberal*, N. Y., 1946, p. 328.
[33] Hurewitz, G., *The Struggle for Palestine*, p. 27.
[34] Edelman, M., *A Political Biography of Ben-Gurion*, p. 92.
[35] Kimche Jon and David, *The Secret Roads*, London, 1954, p. 27.
[36] *Der Spiegel*, 19. XII. 1966.
[37] Arendt, Hannah, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, London, 1963, p. 37.
[38] Melchett, H. L. M., *Thy Neighbour*, N. Y., 1937.
[39] *Maariv*, Israel, April 24, 1966.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Arendt, Hannah, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, p. 55.
[42] *Der Spiegel*, 19. XII. 1966.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Kimche, Jon and David, *The Secret Roads*, p. 54.
[48] Background, *Public Services Division Department of State*, U.S., December 1954, p. 14.
[49] Lilienthal, A., *What Price Israel*, p. 92.
[50] Sachar, H. M., *Israel, The Establishment of the State*, p. 34 (retranslated from the Russian).
[51] Arendt, Hannah, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, pp. 37-38.
[52] Иванов, К. и Шейнис, З., *Государство Израиль, его положение и политика*. Политиздат, 1958, стр. 133.
[53] Judgemens, M. D., *Israel*, 1965, p. 65.
[54] Kimche, Jon and David, *The Secret Roads*, p. 13.
[55] Lilienthal, A., *What Price Israel*, pp. 33-34.
[56] Kimche Jon and David, *The Secret Roads*, p. 13.
[57] Livneh, E., *State and Diaspora*, Jerusalem, 1953, p. 15.
[58] *The American Jewish Conference* (Proceedings of the 2nd Session), N. Y., 1945, p. 70.
[59] Ibid., p. 73.
[60] Ibid., p. 134.
[61] Ibid., pp. 307, 317, 100.
[62] Ben-Gurion, *Israel: Years of Challenge*, New York, 1963, p. 22.
[63] Ibid., p. 24.
[64] *Palestine Year-Book*, Vol. III, edited by Sophie A. Udin, N. Y., 1947-1948, pp. 326-27.
[65] Lilienthal, A., *What Price Israel*, p. 195.
[66] Ibid., p. 196.
[67] Ibid., pp. 32-33 (retranslated from the Russian).
[68] Ibid., p. 33.
[69] Lilienthal, A., *The Other Side of the Coin*, N. Y., 1965, p. 184.

[70] Lilienthal, A., *What Price Israel*, pp. 207-08.

[71] Weizmann, Ch., *A Biography by Several Hands*, p. 199.

[72] *Palestine Royal Commission Report*, London, 1937, p. 240.

[73] *Towards Union in Palestine*, edited by M. Buber, Jerusalem, 1947, p. 7.

[74] Vilner, M., *The Palestine Problem and the Israel-Arab Dispute*, CPI, Tel Aviv, p. 5 (retranslated from the Russian).

[75] Ibid.

[76] Levenberg, S., *The Jews and Palestine*, pp. 176-77.

[77] Ibid., pp. 180-81.

[78] *Forum*, Jerusalem, 1959, p. 96.

[79] Гожанский, И., *Формирование рабочего класса Израиля и его положение*, 1966, ЛГУ, дипломная работа.

[80] Гожанский, Э., *Сборник статей и речей*, Тель-Авив, издание КПИ, 1959, стр. 42.

CHAPTER IV

[1] Zeromski, A., *Na zachód od Jordanu*, Warszawa, 1965, str. 172.

[2] ЦГАОР, ф. ДП, ОО, 1914, д. 44, л. 19.

[3] *Communist Party of Israel. Central Committee Information Bulletin*, Tel Aviv, 1965.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Zeromski, A., *Na zachód od Jordanu*, str. 36.

[6] Ben-Gurion, *Israel: Years of Challenge*, pp. 232, 233.

[7] Walichnowski, T., "Od Jeufratu az do Nilu", *Kontynenty* No. 2, 1968.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Zeromski, A., *Na zachód od Jordanu*, str. 236.

[11] Ibid., str. 27.

[12] Weingrod, A., *Israel. Group Relations in a New Society*, London, 1965, p. 39.

[13] Ibid., p. 41.

[14] Ibid., p. 75.

[15] *US News and World Report*, April 17 and 10, 1967.

[16] Zeromski, A., *Na zachód od Jordanu*, str. 152-53.

[17] Vilner, M., *The Palestine Problem and the Israel-Arab Dispute*, CPI, Tel Aviv.

[18] Ibid.

[19] *On the Situation of the Arabs in Israel*, CPI, Tel Aviv, September 1966.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Vilner, M., *The Palestine Problem...*, p. 28.

[22] Zeromski, A., *Na zachód od Jordanu*, str. 227.

[23] *On the Situation of the Arabs in Israel*, CPI, September 1966.

[24] *CPI Press Release*, February 1966.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Sneh, M., *Israeli Economy*, CPI, 1961, p. 8.

[27] Walichnowski, T., "Od Jeufratu az do Nilu", *Kontynenty* No. 2, 1968.

[28] *Zo Hadereh*, 17. 11. 1967.

[29] Vilner, M. "The Israeli Communist Party in the Fight Against Aggression and for Peace", *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 11, No. 4, April 1968, p. 73.

[30] *Newsweek*, November 15, 1965, pp. 43-44.

[31] Zeromski, A., *Na zachód od Jordanu*, str. 118.

[32] *Haolam Nazeh* No. 1530, Israel, 28. XII. 1966 (Hebrew).

[33] Андрейчук, А., «Проникновение Израиля в Африку». *Азия и Африка сегодня* № 2, 1967, стр. 36.

[34] *Government Year Book*, Jerusalem, 5720 (1959-1960), p. 69.

[35] Brecher, M., *The New States of Asia*, London, 1963, p. 147.

[36] *World Marxist Review*, April 1968, p. 73.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Косыгин, А. Н., «Выступление на чрезвычайной специальной сессии Генеральной ассамблеи ООН 19 июня 1967 г.». *Правда*, 20 июня 1967 г.

[39] *World Marxist Review*, April 1968, p. 74.

[40] *Davar*, Israel, August 22, 1967.

[41] «Письмо из Израиля». *Правда*, 6 апреля 1968 г.

[42] *The Worker*, USA, January 7, 1968.

[43] *Deutsche Volkszeitung*, 13. VI. 1945, Berlin.

CHAPTER V

[1] *Menorah Journal*, USA, February. 1928.

[2] *The New York Times*, January 2, 1953 (retranslated from the Russian).

[3] Чернов, В., «Тайная война Израиля». *Красная Звезда*, 3 октября 1967 г.

[4] *Daily Mail*, June 2, 1967.

[5] *Jerusalem Post*, August 17, 1951 (retranslated from the Russian).

[6] Lilienthal, A., *The Other Side of the Coin*, p. 208.

[7] Ibid., p. 194.

[8] Lenin, V. I., *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 29.

[9] *World Jewish Congress*, July 31, 1966, p. 8 (retranslated from the Russian).

[10] *Socialist International Information*, 1966-1967.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

CAUTION: ZIONISM! by Soviet Marxist historian Yuri Ivanov is a convincing exposé of modern Zionism as an ideology, a system of organisations and the practical policies of the wealthy Jewish bourgeoisie. Basing his arguments on numerous documents and facts, the author shows that Zionism has been and is a bellicose reactionary force working against the genuine national interests of all peoples, the Israeli people inclusive.